

AN
ESSAY
AGAINST
ARIANISM

And some other

HERESIES:

OR, A

REPLY

TO

Mr. WILLIAM WHISTON'S
Historical Preface

AND

APPENDIX to HIS

Primitive Christianity revived.

By m^r maittaire. 4th Ed.

LONDON,

Printed for H. CLEMENTS, at the *Half-Moon*
in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*. 1711.

AN
ESSAY
AGAINST
ARIANISM
AND ITS
REFUTATION
BY
MR. WILLIAM WATSON
HISTORICAL PRACTICE
AND
APPENDIX TO THE
PRINCIPLES OF THE
RELIGION
OF THE
CHRISTIANITY



*To the Most Reverend the
Archbishops, the Right
Reverend the Bishops; the
Reverend Prolocutor, and
Members of the Convoca-
tion.*

MOST REVEREND, &c.

SINCE this *Arian* has had the Confidence to affront, and (as it were) defy your Ecclesiastical Power with the Dedication of that heap of Heresies, his Historical Preface; I most humbly crave leave of addressing my self to your Reverences with this following Essay: wherein I have endeavoured briefly to answer that pestilent Pamphlet; and assert the Eternal Divinity of the Son of God, and of the Holy Ghost, and the Unity of the Godhead in a Trinity of Persons; as
A 2 those

Epistle Dedicatory.

those incomprehensible Mysteries and fundamental Articles of our Faith are revealed in Holy Scriptures, handed down to us from the earliest Ages of Christianity to this time, and believed not only by the Church of *England*, but by the Generality of Christian Churches all the World over.

The *English* Translation of the Heretick *Valentinus Gentilis's* History was several Years ago presented to your Lordships: 'So is now this Account of a Successor of his, who is so far from coming behind him, that he rather outstrips him in his Blasphemies. For to whom else should we fly for assistance, when Wolves enter in among us, when Men arise speaking perverse things to draw Disciples after them? To whom can we then apply our selves, but to those, whom God has made Overseers over his Flock? That indefatigable Enemy of Mankind, having hitherto so constantly distracted our Church by Schism and Schismatical Opinions, now brings his other Engine, Heresy, against it: So near a-kin are these two Plagues, that the one seldom fails to usher in, and prepare the way for the other; the tearing asunder of the Unity of the Church being ever a ready step to rend the Unity of the Faith; and therefore the great Apostle of the Gentiles earnestly recommends to his *Ephesians* the Unity of the first as the most effectual way to secure that
of

Epistle Dedicatory.

of the second. God is one; and as 'tis our Lord's chief Design and fervent Prayers to his Father, that his Church be one; so 'tis the Devil's aim, whose Works he came to destroy, to multiply the one, and divide the other. And this Tool of that evil Spirit is acted by him now to introduce a Majority and Minority, and consequently a Plurality, in the Godhead, and by these means to subvert the prime Corner-stone of our Faith and Church.

Whenever a Flame any where breaks out, may not even the meanest Person (tho many others besides perceive it as well as he, and are much abler than he to quench it) not only cry out, Fire, but also hasten thither, with what Water his, tho ne'er so scanty, Vessels can carry? And therefore in this common Danger, which threatens the Peace and Unity not only of our *Jerusalem* at home, but even of all the Christians dispersed over the Face of the whole Earth; be not displeased, Reverend Fathers, if the least of your Flock with all due and awful Respect approaches you, and with the deepest Concern represents the impending Calamity before your profound Wisdoms. I am indeed sensible, how insufficient the utmost of my Ability must needs prove toward the stopping this mighty Evil; and how that the handling of this Controversy is more properly the business of the Clergy, than

Epistle Dedicatory

than of one who has not been called to and honoured with the Holy Function of waiting on God's Altar and watching over his Heritage. Yet I could not dispense with my self, if I did not discharge some part of my Duty as a Christian, and lay hold of this Opportunity to make an open Profession of the Christian Faith, especially at present, when it is so publickly opposed and reviled. I have in this Discourse made it my business to guide my self, to the best of my Knowledge, by Holy Scripture, and the Doctrine of our Church, to whose Judgment I do and always shall entirely submit my self; waiting with humble patience the time, when this and all other Disturbers thereof shall be silenced by your Censure and Authority, which he has already but too much slighted and trampled upon.

He indeed [p. 16. of his Historical Preface] owns you as the principal Guides of this Church, having a just right to be consulted in matters of this Nature and Moment; but at the same time he knows, what he affirms, to have been the ancient Doctrine; and [p. 17.] he proposes it to the Archbishop's Consideration, what way to take in the management of the matter; yet no worldly motives whatsoever shall dissuade him from publishing his Collections. The Archbishop of *Canterbury* sends him [p. 18.] to consult Bishop *Bull*; he instead
of

Epistle Dedicatory.

of that [p. 68.] warns both learned and unlearned against his Writings. What is this but trifling and equivocating with, and resisting his Metropolitan? My Lord of *York* [p. 19, 20.] reproved his Fondness for new Notions, adding, that his Design of imposing new Articles contrary to the Definitions of the *Nicene* Council would disturb the Peace and Unity of the Catholick Church. Now after having pretended to ask by Letters the Advice of the two Archbishops, and received such sharp Rebukes from one, and no manner of Encouragement from either; still to persist in his obstinacy of publishing his Heresies; what is this but to be guilty of the greatest breach of Modesty, and act in a direct opposition to and contempt of his Superiors? The Bishop of *Worcester* [p. 21, 25, 29, to p. 41.] calls him a Subverter of Souls and Enemy to the Church of Christ, adding that 'tis unlikely that any part of the Faith lost since the *Nicene* Times should be now found by him; accusing him of Pride, Vanity, Obstinacy, and Heretical Pravity; and besides this Prelate (out of his great Charity for the bringing him back to the Faith of the Church) confutes his Errors from Scripture and Antiquity in a long and very learned Letter: for the Publication of which we are (if it be possible to be so to an Heretick) obliged to him: and I look upon this as a very signal Providence, that
the

Epistle Dedicatory.

the same Book, which disperses the Poison, should also with it carry its Antidote ; for so I may call that excellent Epistle, which has in it more of irrefragable Conviction, than any of this Heretick's Reasonings, which he with so great an Arrogance pretends to be [p. 73.] unanswerable. However tho' the Publication of this learned Prelate's Letters can't but be very acceptable to all Orthodox Christians, yet it by no means excuses him for exposing to open view (without leave asked or granted) Archbishops, Bishops, and private Men's [p. 51, 56, 61.] Letters ; and if dealing thus with Equals deserves no other Character than that of Rudeness and Uncivility, what can this Rudeness with Superiors be but the highest degree of Insolence ? Besides this is not the only piece of unfair Dealing or want of Manners and Respect, as well as Violation of (what ever was accounted most sacred) Friendship, he is guilty of in this Particular ; but some of those Letters he thus makes free with, are by him mangled, partly exposed, partly suppressed, as his boldness thinks fittest ; And so hath he omitted [p. 43.] a long *Appendix* to the Bishop of *Worcester's* Letter, concerning our Saviour's last Passover and Death, which he placed on the 15th and his Lordship on the 14th of the Month *Nisan* ; as likewise part of a Letter of the Bishop of *Norwich* [p. 50.] who also warns him

Epistle Dedicatory.

him of his Errors, and adviseth him to a little more Coolness. This Man, after so many Checks and Admonitions from his Superiors, as well as others, after a notorious Sentence of Expulsion passed on him by his University, without the least Sign of Remorse or Modesty, ravingly [as the Bishop of *Worcester* expresses it, p. 43.] and in a very indecent Warmth [as he himself owns it, p. 69. but still without any Offer at Repentance and Amendment] pursues the Propagation of his Heresy; and by a Letter to each of the Archbishops magisterially prescribes and dictates to them, how to correct (what he impiously terms) modern Errors; such as the Use of the *Athanasian* Creed [p. 68, 69.] hoping, against all reason, that his Freedom and Resolution will not be blamed, and colouring these wicked Practices with the specious Pretence of a real Concern for Truth and Piety. [p. 69, 70.] Being not content to have thus by two Letters braved our Metropolitans, and imboldned by their Graces patient silence (for he tells us he received no answer to the second, p. 70. and who knows, but by the Help of his wonted Familiarity with his Betters, and overgrown Opinion of his own unanswerable Infallibility, he may improve their Silence into an Approbation and Consent) he triumphs over their Lordships in a third, bragging that he plainly finds the Learned hitherto no ways able to oppose his

Epistle Dedicatory.

too strong Evidence; and so supposing that his Papers would be allowed no Examination, resolves to make them publick; and finds himself obliged (and a bold Man seldom is long indebted upon the score of obliging himself) to print their Graces and others Letters [p. 113, 114.] from which Words I inferr'd, what I writ before, that Leave was never asked; and, if they of their own good Will to him granted it without asking, I'll be bound (tho' satisfied, as infallibly as he, and upon better grounds than he pretends to be in things of greater Moment, that I shall ne'er have any Occasion of being call'd upon) to beg his Pardon. He assumes in his whole Deportment an Air of Infallibility and therefore having ingrossed the whole Stock thereof to himself, I wonder the less, if he grudges any the least share of it to the Church of *Rome*, [p. 31. *Append.*] and if transported with Jealousie for, and Presumption upon that his assumed Prerogative, he, notwithstanding the Obedience he has sworn to our Church, seems to cast a very envious Eye and Reflection at her Power in Controversies of Faith, [*Append.* p. 30.]

He [*Append.* p. 31, 32.] draws a Parallel between his Case of being condemned at *Cambridge* for asserting what was undeniable and unanswerable, and the Case of the Protomartyr *St. Stephen*; and here indeed, that

Epistle Dedicatory.

that I may not wrong him, a fit of Modesty seizeth his Spirits (well it may) and so he condescends to make due Allowance for the Difference of the Persons. Yet the Fit is but a mere Fit, and he soon recovers his natural haughty Temper, enlarging on his Parallel, as that the *Jews*, being not able to resist the Martyr's Wisdom and Spirit, accused him in their Consistory, were cut to the Heart, gnashed upon him, stopped their Ears, and without any Formality of Law, stoned him; and that if such Violence be used toward him, he is ready to say, Lord, lay not this Sin to their Charge. From this, without the farther Trouble of drawing at full the other side of this blasphemous Comparison, 'tis plain enough, with what spiritual Pride this Heretick is possessed; so far as to dare my Lord of *Worcester* [p. 28.] for discouraging his Attempt to correct our present Establishment, and [p. 49.] beg him (but sawcily) not to defend, like his great Predecessor, modern Corruptions.

Having now, worthy Prelates, with the tender of my most humble Duty to your Lordships and others the Governours of our Church and Representatives of the whole Clergy in Convocation assembled, presented this following Essay, (tho' with little else to recommend it to so high a Patronage, besides the Cause which it defends) as a Token of my hearty Wishes for the peacea-

Epistle Dedicatory.

ble Continuance of the Christian Faith, by the Pious Care of our Religious Princes established, and under your auspicious Influence still flourishing among us; and having also set forth the Danger, which we may very justly apprehend from this Heretick, and his undaunted resolute Behaviour: May I, by your Permission, pay my Respects, as I am particularly bound, and a publick Acknowledgment to those two great Bodies of Learning, the two Universities of the Kingdom of *England*; who have each, in their turns, demonstrated their Abhorrence, and performed their Parts in a vigorous Opposition to Heresie: The one by a solemn Decree and Censure (1695. Nov. 25.) occasioned by a Sermon, wherein were asserted three distinct infinite Minds and Substances in the Trinity; and strictly forbidding all under their Charge to preach or publish the same Doctrine: The other by a Sentence of their Convocation against the Tenets and Person of this present Heretick (1710. Oct. 30.) And some years before [p. 51.] Dr. *Laney*, Master of *Pembroke*, then Vice-Chancellor, 1708. deny'd his *Imprimatur* to this Man's Essay upon the Apostolical Constitutions, giving this Reason, that he thought them not Orthodox. This Reverend Man's timely Zeal was certainly very commendable, for interposing the Authority then vested in him, and putting a stop for that time

Epistle Dedicatory.

time to this Heretical Contagion. And this same Contagion, most Learned Sirs, is now, with very large Improvements, attempting, under the Eyes of all, to spread it self, as far as printing can diffuse it; it gains ground apace, and gathers Strength so much, that nothing but your Authority can check it. 'Tis certain that the Christians abroad, whether *Papists* or *Protestants*, are none of them yet so corrupted and unreformed, as to favour *Arianism*. The Name of that Heresie has been and still is (God be thanked) generally odious, as it partly appears by the violent Proceedings of the State of *Bern* against *Valentinus Gentilis* near 150 Years ago. I hope, for the Reputation of the Church of *England*, no foreign Church or Congregation shall prevent our Renowned Clergy (on whom the Eyes of all Christendom are fixed) in Censuring this Heretick.

I think I can't wish well to the Catholick Faith of Christianity without wishing the utter Extirpation of Heresie, or, if that can't be, the Hindrance of its Growth, for such Tares will, nay *must* (as *St. Paul* has warn'd us) spring up among the Wheat in spite of the utmost Care; but let not Tares, nor any noxious Weeds be permitted to raise themselves above and top the wholesome Corn. This my Wish proceeds not from a persecuting Spirit: I abhor Persecution in every Clime, not only a *French Popish* one, but all others
under

Epistle Dedicatory.

under all Denominations whatsoever; I hate a *persecuting Episcopacy*, no less than the *persecuting of it*: And so tho' I heartily pray a stop may be put to Heresy, yet I desire no farther Prosecution of any Heretick, than censuring him and silencing his Tongue and Pen; the Methods of doing which are to be submitted to the Prudence of our Governors, in Church and State. Very pregnant Hopes are given to every Member and Lover of our Ecclesiastical Constitution, from that hearty Zeal towards it, which appears in the great Council of this Nation in Parliament assembled; and more particularly shew'd itself in that Pious Resolution of the Honourable House of Commons, 1711. *March 1.* upon the Message of the Reverend the lower House of Convocation, 1711. *Febr. 28.* The Resolution was, that they *will, in all Matters relating to Religion, and the Welfare of the established Church, have a particular Regard to such Applications, as shall, at any time, be made to them from the Clergy, in Convocation assembled, &c.* May then the Blessings of Heaven be shower'd down upon; may the Prayers of all good Men in general, and of the Clergy in particular, be constantly put up for those worthy Patriots, who have so generously engag'd themselves in behalf of Religion, and the Cause of our Church; and provided, that the Neglect of either can never be laid at their Door. Is not *Heresy a mat-*
ter

Epistle Dedicatory.

ter of Religion? Is not its Propagation by publishing and defending it, against the *Welfare of our established Church?* It is therefore the Duty of every good Man to wish, that the one may be taken into Consideration in order to secure the other.

And that the one God in three Persons, Coessential and Coequal, may inspire you with what is best to be done for the Preservation of this National and Apostolical Church, the purest Branch of the Catholick One, is the constant and fervent Prayer of,

MOST REVEREND, &c.

Your Most Humble,

Dutiful, and

Obedient Servant,

M. MAITTAIRE,

A N
Historical Preface,
TO THE
R E A D E R.

Christian Reader,



R. Whiston's Historical Preface, soon after it was published, was put into my Hands, by a Friend, who, having given me but an imperfect and general Account of it, desired me to peruse it carefully at my leisure. My Curiosity was very eager to be satisfied with the real Truth of the Character, which I had accidentally, both at Cambridge and at London, taken up of his new peculiar Notions relating to Religion. I had not yet been acquainted with Particulars, and therefore
the

Historical Preface.

ii

the Task, imposed on me by my Friend, was by me very cheerfully embrac'd. I had hardly read two Pages, when to my great Surprise, I found him openly declaring himself for Arianism; and a little after, affirming, with the Apollinarians, that our Saviour's human Nature had no other rational Soul, but the λόγος, or his Divinity, which supplied it; and then that the Holy Ghost was not to be invocated, asserting him, with Macedonius, [p. 28.] not to be Consubstantial and Coequal with the Father and Son.

The farther I went, the deeper I found my self engaged in Heresy; and before the 11th Page, he had stript each of the three Divine Persons of his Attributes, and quite dismiss'd the great Mystery of Trinity in Unity. With him, the first Person was no more Father from everlasting; the second was not Son by an eternal Generation; the third no God: So there was a time, when there was neither Father, nor Son, nor Holy Ghost, and therefore no Trinity: God the Father was now bereft of his eternally beloved Word: God the Son become a Creature; both his Natures stained with Imperfection, the Divine wanted its Divine Eternity, the Human its Human Soul; the Son of God was not perfect God, the Son of Man not perfect Man: Lastly, the Holy Ghost was denied his Invocation. The mysterious Link of the three Persons, the Coequality was loosen'd; and an Im-

b

parity

parity or Difference of Essences brought in, to juggle out the Unity of the Godhead. Standest thou not amazed, Pious Reader, and canst thou see, without Horror, what Havock this, more than Heathen, Heretick makes of our great Mysteries of Godliness? Yet these damnable Principles are brought in, and dressed up by him, under the Venerable Title of Original Primitive Faith; and true Orthodoxy exploded and traduc'd by the odious Names of Pagan Philosophy, and Antichristian Tyranny [p. 16, 27.] One would have thought that the Devil had been sufficiently beaten out of these his strong Holds long ago, and those monstrous Heresies too powerfully baffled and confounded, by many Fathers and Councils, and kept under by standing Confessions of Faith, than to rise again in our Days: But St. Paul has told us, that there must be Heresies, that they which are approved, may be manifest, (1 Cor. xi. 19.) And if they could take Birth in the times of a much greater Apostolical Holiness, no wonder now if they revive in this deprav'd and vicious Generation. Our upstart Heretick, tho' he comes not a whit behind his Ancestors in Pride and Stubbornness, standeth not upon any higher Ground, than they; and however after having read over (as he owns p. 4.) the New Testament twice, it might have been expected he had by the Help of the evil Spirit, which, no doubt, inspires him, brought some fresh Proofs of
of

of wrested Scripture, for the Support of his Opinions; yet I can find but five, which (as we may see in several of the Fathers) used to be alledged, with a mistaken Sense, against the Orthodox by Arius, Eunomius, and the rest of that Herd; which Passages shall be afterwards examined in a proper Place.

How surprizing is this, that a Man can't be convinced by the Light of the Gospel itself! But a Heretick may drink Poison in the Fountain of Life; as Judas Damnation in that Cup, where the Apostles found everlasting Bliss. God giveth Grace to the Humble, and his Book, if we expect to reap Benefit by it, ought to be read with Humility. Pride is the grand Sin of Satan, and the inseparable Attendant of Heresy; whence it comes, that a Heretick is the most unqualified Person to read those Divine Oracles, which require in the Reader that Virtue, to which he is so much a Stranger.

This Arian, or rather, this Legion of Heresy, as he multiplies God, by making the Father and the Son two distinct Essences; has as fertile a Faculty at multiplying God's Word; by adding a new Set of Books, never yet owned as Canonical; and herein indeed (if I be not mistaken) he outstrips his Predecessors, for I never heard or read that they ever attempted to trump up any other Sacred Books, than what were by the Church admitted into the Canon.

V Historical Preface.

He seems besides to lay the main Stress of his Cause, upon some Questions, which he proposes to the Orthodox, and fancies unanswerable: Such as these, [p. 9, 10, &c.]

I. Where are the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost called one God in Scripture or the most Primitive Writers?

II. Where is Christ in Scripture, or most Primitive Writers, said to be properly equal to the Father?

III. Where is Christ in the new Testament, or most Primitive Writers, call'd God the Creator, &c. the blessed God, &c. God over all, &c.

IV. Where do the Scriptures, or most Primitive Writers say any thing of the Substance or Essence of God? and where do they affirm the Father and the Son to be Coessential and Consubstantial?

X. Where is the Holy Ghost directly call'd God or Lord in the Scripture or most Primitive Writers?

XI. What one Christian, till sometime after the Council of Nice ever ventur'd to invoke the Holy Ghost?

He has one and twenty of these Questions, but I'll exemplifie in these.

I must acquaint him first, that 'twill avail him little to press for a direct Answer, since 'tis

'tis as effectual and concluding to answer by way of Inference; as our Saviour most frequently does E. G. Matth. xi. 2. John's Disciples asking, Art thou he that should come? He answers them, by urging his Miracles, from which they might infer, that he was he, who should come, as Eisaiah prophesied, chap. xxxv. ver. 4, 5, &c. and chap. lxi. ver. 1. Luke. iv. 18. Again Matth. xxii. 23, 32. He convinces the Sadduces of the Truth of the Resurrection, by an Inference from Exod. iii. 6. I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Sometimes that Inference is made in replying to a Question by another; as Matth. xv. 2, 3. When the Scribes and Pharisees asked him, why his Disciples eating Bread with unwashen Hands, transgress'd the Tradition of the Elders: He ask'd them, why, by their Tradition they transgress'd the Commandment of God, in dishonouring their Parents. And, it may be observ'd, throughtout the Gospels, that our Lord makes use of this way of arguing, rather than giving a direct Answer; and therefore I look upon it to be a closer Method of Reasoning, or (at least) as didactical and sufficient as the other.

This being premised, I say that this Man's Questions may be sufficiently answer'd, tho' not all of them directly.

To his 1st Question, I answer, from 1 John v. 7. which I look upon as a direct Answer. And then out of Justin Martyr in his Exposition
of

p. 56 of Faith, It becomes us to confess one God, made known in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, owning these Subsistences to have but one Divinity, &c. And again he calls Father, Son, and Holy Ghost one Divinity, &c. with a great deal more to the same Effect.

To the 2^d, I answer directly from Phil. ii. 5, 6. and Justin Martyr in his Work quoted before asserteth an Identity of Essence, τὸ αὐτὸν ἔσθαι in the Trinity; and that the Son and the Holy Ghost are not inferior in Power to the Father.

Justin Martyr, in his Dialogue with Trypho, applies these several Titles to our Saviour out of several Places of Holy Scripture, Psal. xxiv. 8, 10. King of Glory, Lord (Jehovah) strong and mighty, the Lord (Jehovah) of Hosts. Psal. iv. 7. God the King of all the Earth. Psal. xcix. 2, 3. The Lord (Jehovah) Great, and High, whose Name is Great, Terrible, and Holy. Psal. lxxii. 18. Blessed Lord God. And in his second Apology, Exod. ii. 14. I AM THAT I AM. Ver. 16. The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

To the 3^d, I answer directly from Rom. ix. 5. and also by Inference from John i. 2. for if the Word is God, all things were made by him, he therefore is God the Creator.

To the 4th, I answer directly from Exod. iii. 14. and Apocal. xvi. 7. that the Essence of God is said to be everlasting to everlasting, as Psal. xc. 2. and Justin Martyr, in his Cōbortation to the Greeks, expounds these Words I am that I am, to signifie the Eternity of God. Is not this then to say something of the Substance and Essence of God? And nothing of an Incomprehensible Being can be said, besides what that Being has thought fit to reveal to us of himself.

To the other part of the 4th Question I have answer'd by Inference in the following Discourse, p. 24. and from what was quoted from Justin Martyr to the 2^d Question, the Consubstantiality and Coessentiality will undeniably follow.

To the 10th and 11th, I answer by Inference from Acts v. 3, 4. and from these Words of Justin Martyr in his 2^d Apology, we worship and adore (οἰσόμεθα καὶ προσκυνήσωμεν) the Son and the Prophetick Spirit. Here is a positive Instance from this most Primitive Father for the Worship and Adoration (οἰσῶμεν καὶ προσκυνήσωμεν) of the Holy Ghost: tho' he [p. 47.] rejects the Authority of his own Bible, The Constitutions of the Apostles, (as interpolated) which my Lord of Worcester urged [p. 35.] for the Invocation of the Holy Ghost. Neither is this Evasion of his to the purpose [p. 46.] That he allows the blessed Spirit is.. to be worshipp'd in those Forms of Doxologies
and

and Blessing, but never by Invocation. For since Invocation is part of Divine Worship, be, to whom Worship is due, may justly claim Invocation. The Worship or Service of God (*προσκυνώσεις καὶ λατρίαις*, Matth. iv. 10.) ever includes Prayers; Anna the Prophetess served God with fasting and Prayers, (*δεδούσα λατρεύουσα*, Luke ii. 37.) Cornelius the Centurion served God by Prayer, Acts x. 2.

I answer then, either by Inference, that if the Holy Ghost be God, and to be worshipped, he must also be invoked: or by another Question; where, either in Scripture old and new, or in any ancient Writer either before or since the Nicene Times, do we read, that Invocation is not a Part of Divine Worship and Service? For since they are joined in Scripture, who shall dare to put them asunder? And besides I shall very confidently affirm, that, if the Practice of any thing can be enforced from Scripture-Authority, tho' no Instance of that Practice could be found in the Records of Ecclesiastical Matters before the Nicene Times, there is no Colour of Reason, why that Practice should be omitted. Again, if the Practice appears not in the Extant Records of those Ages, who shall assure me, that it is not in those Records, which are lost, since none will say that none of them are lost?

I know very well that what I have produced, and shall produce afterwards from Justin Martyr's

Historical Preface.

x

Martyr's Exposition of Faith, may by Hereticks (who will not scruple to expunge out of the Fathers what makes against them) as by Valentinus Gentilis (Brief Account, &c. p. 94.) be disputed as not genuine. But their or any one's bare Scepticism shall not be admitted as a sufficient Plea, against Leontius and Euthymius, who quote this very Work of the Martyr; and tho' it be mentioned neither by Photius in his Bibliotheca, nor S. Hierom or Eusebius, in the Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, yet Eusebius in the 4th of his Eccles. Hist. chap. 18. affirms, that there were very many others of the laborious Works of Justin Martyr, besides those which he there reckons up. This Work of the Martyr about the Exposition of Faith is very plain in relation to the Trinity, and our Saviour's two Natures: And there is a great likelihood that this good Father having asserted one God in his Cohortation, and one Lord in his Dialogue with Trypho, did also assert the Trinity, and our Saviour's two Natures in this Treatise; that he might confute not only Heathens and Jews, but also convince Hereticks, against whom he in his 2^d Apology affirms himself to have composed a Book, which is lost. And tho' the time of this Martyr, who suffer'd in the Year 161, is long before Arius; yet many Hereticks had before Arius attempted to corrupt the Christian Faith: Cerinthus (as Ric-

c

ciolus

ciotis places it in his Chronology) in the Year 70, denied the Divinity of our Saviour, Ebion about that time affirmed Christ and the Holy Ghost to have been created; and I make no doubt, but that St. John both in his Gospel and Catholick Epistle had a great regard to the growth of these Heresies, when he in his Gospel so plainly asserted our Lord's Divinity; and in that Epistle so often inveighs against those who deny him, and so positively asserts the Trinity. Nor shall Manuscripts against 1 John v. 7. be of any force, while the universal Consent of all Christian Churches continues it still in their Bibles. Besides the greater number of MSS (as far as I have yet been able to inform my self) are for the Text; for of all the sixteen very old ones, which Robert Stephens tells us (in his Preface to his Greek Testament 1550) he had collated, there are but seven, which have it not, and which he hath specified in the Margin of that Testament. What new ones have been found out since (which I mean, when in p. 48. of my Reply I say One or Two, their number being not so considerable, as to outweigh the Authority of those formerly known) I ne'er made it my business to inquire. But since the Doctrine of that Text is the same, with what may be gather'd from other places of Scripture, and the omission of it may help to introduce, what is contrary to several uncontested Points of Christianity,

stianity, I think it, at least safer, to believe that it was struck out by some Hereticks to shake, rather than that it was inserted by the Orthodox to establish, what was already by other Texts sufficiently grounded: tho' there are, to my knowledge, some, who even, if the Authority of that Text was no way opposed, think it insufficient to prove, what it is brought for. So resolved are these Scepticks in Religion, that, if there be any clear proof produced for the belief of any of its Mysteries, the greatest Industry is by them used wholly to stifle; or, if that can't be done, by pitiful Cavils to evade its Authority.

I shall not think it worth my while, either here or any where else, to run through all this man's weak Questions, otherwise than briefly thus: [5 and 6.] we retain the *ὁμοούσιον* and [7, 8.] we own the Equality of the Son with the Father and his eternal Generation, because these are agreeable to Holy Writ; and [9.] we deny the Sufferings of the Divine Nature of our Saviour, because they are not consistent with it; and this shall be made good hereafter. Then as to the rest of his Queries I reply that we esteem no Doctrine Orthodox approved by the Church of Rome, but what is grounded on Scripture and Primitive Antiquity; upon that same bottom we receive the Athanasian Creed, the first four General Councils; that we admit nothing of Athanasius,

and reject nothing of any one without examining it according to Scripture and Antiquity; that it matters little what ancient Books are lost, as long as God hath preserved his for our Guide; and that it is very happy that almost all, and were happier if all, the Writings of the Hereticks Arians and Apollinarians were utterly perished; that our modern Belief is ancient, and built on Revelation, and Human Reasoning, yet no farther than it is governed by the other; that what we deny against him is as groundless, as what we deny against the Papists; and the Texts wrested by him shall be examined in due place; that the Object of our implicate Faith is God's Word solely; and not General Councils, nor Athanasius, neither the Church of Rome; that we pervert not any Notions or Words, and use them no other ways than we are authorized by holy Writ, and ancient Writers. Lastly that it will be proved afterwards, that he and his Friends the Arians have plainly falsified and put a wrong sense upon Scripture.

Thus much for his Questions in general; Those, wherein his particular Heresies are couched, shall be confuted particularly and at large: and as for the rest, there is no need of answering, when, what things he in them charges us with, are most notoriously false.

His new Form of Baptism, and new Creed in it, as well as his Presumption in making
use

use of it, will (I suppose) be look'd into by the Governours of our Church. He tells us [p. 13.] he could hardly tell how to forgive himself as a Clergy-man, (so, adds he, but I can't guess, what he means by it, I then us'd to express my self) when He consider'd, how long he had been in Holy Orders, without so much as once seeing or perusing so inestimable a Work (as the Apostolical Constitutions) favourable to the Arian Opinions. I much more wonder, and am less able to tell, how any one can forgive a Clergy-man (the more pity he ever was, and more excusable would he be, had he never been ordained one) who, after having long been in Orders, can't forgive himself for not having sooner attempted to revive Arianism among us, by setting so great a value upon what he finds (for I never read the Apostolical Constitutions, and I only take it upon his and his Friend's [p. 12.] word that they are) favourable to that Heresy. The Opinion I have ever had of them by Report, and am confirmed in by the Bishop of Worcester's Testimony in his Letter [p. 35.] is this, that the Compilers of them made no Conscience of abusing the Names and Authorities of the Apostles of Christ. Several of their Impostures are detected in that Prelate's Letter, and all of them may in time by some good Critick and Divine be exposed to weaken the Foundation, on which this Man pretends to build his erroneus Principles.

Agreat

A great deal of ill Language is by him bestowed, and heavy Charges laid upon Athanasius, [p. 98.] in more than five Leaves; and I know not, whether it will be thought convenient for any Person versed in that great Man's Writings, and acquainted with the History of those Times, to wipe it off; or whether this will be looked upon as needless; because the Dirt (tho' ne'er so plentifully) thrown at that Orthodox Father, will be so far from sticking to or staining him, that it is more likely to fly back upon, and besmear the foul Writer, that threw it. But let our learned and pious Clergy decide that Case, and do that, which most conduces to the good of the Catholick Church.

He [p. 103.] depressoes Athanasius much below Eusebius (of Cæsarea he no doubt means, *Scandal. Hist. eccl. l. i. c. 18. p. 222. mentions Eusebius* tho' without a distinction from the other of Nicomedia, a profess'd Arian) and writes that the Integrity and Abilities of the last are too well known to have those of the first come in the least competition with them. Eusebius is indeed by all applauded for his Ecclesiastical History and Chronological Canon; but under a great suspicion of Arianism: So that tho' Socrates Scholasticus in the 21st Chapter of the 2^d Book of his Ecclesiastical History does all he can to clear him, yet St. Hierom, Photius, *Latin. ed. p. 236. 237* and Zonaras accuse him downright as a Favourer of it. Valesius in his Life prefix'd to his Edition of Eusebius's History owns, that after
the

the Nicene Synod be perpetually conversed with the chief of the Arians; and that, altho' he asserted the Eternity of the Son of God against that Heresy, yet he never from his heart approved the Term *ὁμοῖον* Consubstantial. I therefore don't wonder that our present Arian is so partial to Eusebius, who never was much a Friend to Athanasius. However, let Eusebius's Credit stand or fall in the Judgment of the several Writers of no small Note and Learning, I'm sure he in the 25th Chapter of the 3^d Book of his Ecclesiastical History, where he enumerates the undisputed, disputed, and spurious Books of the New Testament, makes no mention of the Apostolical Constitutions, and reckons among the last the *τῶν Ἀποστόλων λεγόμεναι Διδασκαί* Doctrines said (to be) of the Apostles, by which word *λεγόμεναι* said, he seems to intimate farther, that to father those Doctrines upon the Apostles was Forgery. Whether this be not the same with the *διδασκί* Ἀποστόλων the Doctrine of the Apostles, I'll leave to this Heretick to make out. Archbishop Usher in his Dissertation prefix'd to Polycarp's and Ignatius's Epistles very strongly confutes this pretended Authority of the *διδασκί* or *διδασκαί*, *διαταγαί* τῶν ἀποστόλων, the Doctrine or Doctrines, and Constitutions of the Apostles; and I doubt not but that the Credit of this learned Prelate and many others of the same Opinion will go farther, and their Arguments weigh

weigh more, than the word of any single Discoverer; who, as he values himself for running counter to all the most learned, so he ought to have as great a stock of Reason to argue the Christian Word down, as he has of somewhat else to face it with.

ℓ. 2. c. 17.
p. 237. ed.
dal.

Socrates in the place before-quoted takes notice how Eusebius expounded the word ἐκτισθε, used by the Arians against the Orthodox to prove the Son of God to be κτιστός created. "That ἐκτισθε signifies μεταφορικῶς by a Metaphor ἡγετίσθαι ἢ ἡγετίσθαι constituted or appointed; that thus is understood (1 Pet. ii. 13.) κτίσις ἀνθρώπων Human Appointment or Constitution; and (Psal. li. 10) create κτίσθαι in me a clean heart. κτίσθαι signifies ἀποτίθεσθαι perfect or prepare, &c. And this sense is in Hesych. ἐκτίσθαι ἡγετίσθαι, and Suid. ἐκτισθε ἡγετίσθαι ἡγετίσθαι. But this is not all that can be said in relation to this ἐκτισθε, Prov. viii. 22. For

First, A little after, ver. 26. we read ἡννῆκε με he begets me; which plainly shews, that the word ἐκτισθε is not to be understood in any sense that will contradict ἡννῆκε.

Secondly, The Hebrew Authentical Text, ver. 22. bath וְיָרַד possessed me. Aquila, ἐκτίσθαι τὸ με. Theod. γενεχέλευμαι. And tho' the LXX Version expresses it ἐκτισθε, yet I should be prone to think, that ἐκτισθε here might be the same as, or for ἐκτισθε; and Plato in his Cratylus, that the most Ancients called ἡννῆκεν ἡννῆκεν.

integ. The Greek Interpreters in all other places translate קנה by κτίνω, Gen. iv. 1. or ἀγοράζω, 1 Chron. xxi. 24. except this place and Gen. xiv. 19, 22. where קנה is render'd ἐκτισε: and Drusius also guesses it might be mistaken for ἐκτισε, because the η easily runs into an ι. קנה also κτίσις, 1 Chron. xiv. 15. κτῆσις, Gen. xxiii. 18. I grant that κτίνω is not used commonly, but κτίζω; yet those, who are acquainted with the Interpreters of the Sacred Books, know that they use a great many uncommon words; and this ἐκτισε being one of them might soon, and with a very small change, be alter'd into the more common one ἐκτισε. But be the Greek what it will; it matters not; as long as the Hebrew, which is the Original Text, has קנה possessed; The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way: which so well correspondeth with St. John i. 1. The Word was in the beginning with God. And (as St. Hierom observeth upon that place of Proverbs) lest any one might fancy the Son to have begun to be in the beginning of those ways, he has watchfully added, ver. 23. I was set up from everlasting.

He [Append. p. 23.] writes, "that his affirming the Constitutions and Doctrine of the Apostles to be sacred Books of the New Testament is not contrary to the 6th Article of our Church; because it owns the present Sacred Books, being all the Church then knew; and had they known of more, they
d " would

*" would have set them down also; and that
" since 'tis not affirmed in that Article, that
" there are no more than those, his Assertion
" is not contrary thereto. But the Article
teaches, that Holy Scripture, in the name of
which are understood those Canonical Books,
of whose Authority was never any doubt in
the Church, contains all things necessary for
Salvation; and that whatsoever is not writ-
ten therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not
to be believed as an Article of Faith. From
which 'tis plain, first, that the Church by Holy
Scripture means, and restrains it to those re-
hearsed Canonical Books of undoubtable Autho-
rity in the Church; having a regard to the
Past Authority, not to any Future Discoveries.
Secondly, If those Books there mention'd contain
All things necessary to our Salvation, what can
be more than All, but superfluous and need-
less? For thirdly, if any others are produced,
they contain Doctrines either the same, or new,
or contrary. If the same, they are unnecessa-
ry; if new, then the former did not compre-
hend All, as the Church affirms; if contrary,
then they are excluded by the very Article.*

*He [Append. p. 33.] writes, that in the
Point of the Trinity, our Church sometimes
speaks, and commonly prays and practises agree-
ably to those Notions, which he advances. If
then (which I defy him to prove) our Church
owns Arianism in some places, and condemns it
(as 'tis very clear) in many, as expressly in
the*

Historical Preface.

xx

the Athanasian Creed; does not he accuse our Church's Doctrine and Practice of Contradiction? And why pretends he [Append. p. 12.] "to say that he demeans himself inoffensively, "and, as far as possible, with a constant and "regular compliance with the Rules and Orders of the Church of England?

His Banishment from Cambridge he calls, " [Append. p. 28.] directly fighting against " God, and opposing and persecuting the Gospel " and Religion of Christ Jesus; so that, without a timely Repentance and Retraction, " their present Authority and Pretence of an " University-Statute will be too little to excuse " them at the Day of Judgment. And [Ibid. p. 25.] " That the Advice for the Study of " Divinity quoted against him was written " about Feb. 1707; and that what he deliver'd in St. Clement's Church against the " Son's Co-equality to the Father [Ibid. p. 3, " 4.] belongs to the Year 1708; and that if " he has in either case committed any Offences, " they are fully forgiven by the last Act of a " General and Free Pardon; and by that Act " the molestation already given him is penal.

But does an Act of Pardon not only forgive the Criminal for past Crimes, but also intitle him to repeat and maintain them? Does not his abusing that Act of Pardon, by continuing in the same Crimes, aggravate his former guilt, and render it now unpardonable? As to the Statutes of Cambridge-University, whose Authority in

his Case be call'd Pretended, which is the same as Illegal; I don't know them. Yet I don't doubt, but our Universities are intrusted with the Orthodoxy in Religion, as well as the Morality and Learning of their Members: and the greater care is expected there, because there is a greater danger of Infection and its Propagation, where there are so many Youths, the growing hope of the Nation; easy, even upon the account of that tender age, to be led, which way the Lecturers, Tutors, and familiar Acquaintances incline them. Now when a Clergyman in Catechetical Lectures shall presume to deliver Doctrines contrary to our Church, and now for above two Years industriously, openly, and vigorously spread them without the least sign of Modesty or Deference to any of his Superiors, what fault hath the University committed in cutting an infected, incurable (for he [Append. p. 26.] being exhorted did refuse to make any Confession or Retraction) Member from their Society? And if even the University in so desperate and dangerous a case had exceeded the Power given them by the Statute, shall they not be excused, or rather commended, for saving a whole Commonalty from Heresy, which had been irremediable, if they had put it off, upon the nicety of a Statute? which if it be any way deficient, ought rather to be corrected, than the University blamed for supplying its deficiency. Necessity has no Law; and what Christian can forbear, when oppo-
sing

ing a Heretick is by him stil'd directly fighting against God and persecuting the Gospel of Christ; when vindicating the Holy Trinity from Blasphemy is reckon'd inexcusable at the Day of Judgment?

It has been for sometimes rung in our Ears, that, when a Common Enemy threatens a Nation, all jarring Parties ought then to lay aside their Quarrels, and unite against the design'd Invasion. This is our very Case, Religious Reader, for here I make no distinction, but equally bespeak, whosoever owns the Name of Christian, and has a Soul to save, and a Saviour to save it by. Our Common Faith lies at stake; our Common Saviour's eternal Divinity is denied. A Beginning is set to the only begotten Son of God. Our Lord has declared that the Father is in him, and he in the Father (John xvii. 21.) and is there a time, when the Father was without him? He is the Wisdom of the Father, the Power of God, (1 Cor. i. 24.) the Brightness of his Glory, (Hebr. i. 3.) and was the Father ever without his Wisdom, God without Power, his Glory without its Brightness! Because among us poor mortal finite Creatures, a Man in time, but of a Day (οὐδ' ὅτι θνάσκει ἐν χρόνῳ καὶ ἐπαύσει--- saith the Heathen) begets his Son in time; because time has Priority and Posteriority, must the Creator be bound with the same Limits as his Creatures? must he, which has no time, but inhabits Eternity, beget in time?

Can

Can Infinite from himself beget Finite? For is there any thing Finite in God? Can God the Father from himself, beget but what is of the same Substance with himself; Even in natural things, Light begets Light, the Sun begets its Beams; and yet the begetting and the begotten are coeuous, the begotten is not posterior to the begetting. And in a Supernatural Incomprehensible Being; shall God, the Father who is Light, Inaccessible Glorious Light, beget its Brightness, and shall we there fancy any Priority or Posteriority? A Point in Mathematicks is defined to be without Parts. And shall that eternal Point, that Center and Principle of all things, that indivisible Unity have its Substance divided? God the Father and his Personality are inseparable; that ~~inco~~ious and Subsistence is himself, and he can't be abstracted from himself; His Personality is from everlasting, for he is from everlasting; and therefore his Son, without which he is no Father, is also from everlasting. But I'm afraid I pry too far into an Abyss of Light and Glory, which will drown the deepest Reason: The Seraphims themselves cover their Faces, Esai. vi. 2. And both they and we Men must adore him, whom they, much less we, can never comprehend.

How resolute is Heresy, first to break through and gaze into that awful Majesty, which is incircled with unapproachable Light; and next deny that Eternity, the Glory of

of which has blinded the Eyes of their Understanding, and stun'd their unbelieving Reason! Then the Heretick being involved in Darkeness, goes on still stumbling and mistaking his Way, deceiving and being deceived, perverting and being perverted, reaching out his Hand, as blind Elymas (Acts xiii. 8, 11.) to catch at something to guide him in this Darkeness, which he has run himself into. He flies to Antiquity for Help, lays hold of the most Primitive Fathers; and tho' their Arguments are able to redress his Error, yet his Eyes are closed (Acts xxviii. 27.) and because he changed the Glory of the uncorruptible God, he seems given over to a reprobate Mind (Rom. i. 23, 28.); that, which might have been for his Welfare, he turns to himself into a Trap (Psal. lxix. 22.)

Thus our Arian wandring from one Error into another, being misled by an Ignis fatuus, appeals to Antiquity, and is condemned by the very Judges he appeals to. He [p. 81, 86.] in opposition to all the Learned (as 'tis very natural for blind Men to run against them that see) affirms Ignatius's larger, interpolated Epistles, and the three inscribed to Tarsus, Antioch and Hero to be the original Genuine Works of that Apostolick Bishop. I shall not here, in this critical Dispute, pretend, nor am I able to add any thing to what such Pens as the great Usher's, or the learned Pearson's, with several others, have written;

but for once own the Authority of those Epistles he is so fond of. And first, I'll gather, what Passages might seem to make most, if perverted, for his Opinion: Secondly, I'll give them their Orthodox Sense, by comparing them with other Passages of those same Epistles; Thirdly, I'll confirm that Sense, with Quotations from Justin Martyr, whose Words are as liable to be misunderstood, if the Father did not in other Places set his own meaning in a true Light.

First, Epist. ad Tarf. "Some say, that Jesus is not the Son of the Creator; others say that he is God over all.

"Because he is not the God over all, but his Son, he saith, I go up to my Father and your Father, my God and your God, John xx. 17. and, when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him, that put all things under him, that God may be all in all, 1 Cor. xv. 28. Therefore there is (ἐτερον) another, who subjected, and is all in all, and (ἐτερον) another, to whom they are subjected, and who also with them all is subjected.

Epist. ad Antioch. "The Prophets speaking, as from the Person of God, I am the first, and I am after them, and besides me there is no God, Esai. xlv. 6. [The Hebr. is אחרון I am the last] "speak of the Father of all. And of our Lord Jesus Christ, they say

" say, unto us a Son is given, &c. and his
" Name shall be, &c. the mighty God, &c.

" Esai. ix. 6. *The Evangelists saying the Fa-*

" *ther to be the only true God, John xvii. 3.*

[*This Text is quoted by our Heretick as fa-*
vouring his Opinion, Append. p. 27.] " have

" not omitted, what belongs to our Lord, but

" written, In the Beginning was the Word,

" and the Word was with God, and the

" Word was God, &c. John i. 1.

Epistol. Interpol. ad Philadel. " *As Christ*
" *obeys the Father.*

Epistol. Interpol. ad Smyrn. " *Let the*
" *Bishop be subject to Christ, as he to the*
" *Father.*

Secondly, I shall shew, that St. Ignatius,
by condemning those, who affirm, that the Son
is the God over all, means those, who affirm
the Son to be the Father, that the Subjection of
the Son to the Father is by him understood,
of his Human Nature. That the *ἑτερότης* is
not *θεότης* but *ὑποταγή*: another relates
to the Personality, not the Godhead: that be-
sides me there is no God is not meant to ex-
clude the Son; no more than those other
Words, the only true God. That Christ's O-
bedience and Subjection to his Father is meant
of his Human Nature.

The very Text, which St. Ignatius cites,
shews that by God over all is meant the Fa-
ther's Person; I go up to my Father denotes

two Persons, the Son and the Father; and that therefore the Son can't be the Father.

Then the Text of Esai. ix. where we read, besides me there is no God, which he joins to that of Esai. xlv. where the Son is call'd *Deus iqueus* the strong God, shews, that the *Step^o* relates to the Person only.

Epistol. ad Antioch. "Whoever declares
"one and only God (*ὅνα καὶ μόνον θεόν*) for
"the Destruction of Christ's Divinity (*ἐπ'
"ἀναγέσει τὸ θεῖον τοῦ χριστοῦ*) is a Devil
"(*διαβολός*). And who saith Christ is a
"mere Man, is cursed, according to the Pro-
"phet, Jerem. xvii. 5. trusting not in God,
"but in Man.

Epist. ad Philip. "There is one God, and
"Father; and not two or three; this one Being
" (and none besides him) the only true.
"Deut. vi. 4. Thy God is one Lord. Ma-
"lach. ii. 10. Has not one God created us?
"And there is one Son, the Word God.—
"And there is one Paraclet, Ephes. iv. 4.
"—Therefore neither three Fathers, nor
"three Sons, nor three Paraclets, but one
"Father, one Son, one Paraclet. Therefore
"the Lord sending his Apostles to Discipline
" (*μαρτυροῦσαι* to make Disciples) all Na-
"tions commanded them to baptize into
"the Name of the Father, Son, and Ho-
"ly Ghost; *ὅτε εἰς ἓνα τεμένυμον, ὅτε εἰς*
" *τρῆς ἐνανθρωπήσαντας, ἀλλ' εἰς τρεῖς ὁμοτύμους,*
"not into one [God] with three Names [but

“ in three Persons, for what else can three
 “ belong to] nor into three made Man [for
 “ Christ only was so] but into three of one
 “ and the same Honor.

Hear this Apostolick Father, O Heretick!
 and be not a Devil, destroy not Christ's Divi-
 nity, by restraining the one God to the Fa-
 ther. There's none besides one God, and one
 God has created us; The Word is God and hath
 also created us; and therefore the Father and
 the Son are not two, but one God. The Father,
 Son, and Holy Ghost are one; these three Per-
 sons are *ὁμοῦσι*, which they can't be, if the
 Son be less than the Father, if the Holy Ghost
 be less than both, and neither Lord nor God.

Epistol. Ead. “ How is not he God,
 “ who raiseth the Dead, makes the Lame
 “ whole, cleanseth the Lepers; who either mul-
 “ tiplieth or changeth the Being of things, as
 “ the five Loaves and the two Fishes, and the
 “ Water into Wine. ——— Again, How
 “ thinks thou Christ not to be of the Virgin,
 “ but the God over all, the Almighty, Being?
 “ who is he, that sent him? who is his
 “ Lord (*ὁ τὸν κρείσσονα*?) whose Counsell
 “ did he obey?

Is not it plain, that the Holy Bishop, as
 by the first Interrogation he asserts our Lord's
 Divinity, so by the second, his Humanity?
 And he goes on; “ The Son of God made the
 “ Body (*σάρκα*) not to need Sustenance
 “ forty Days and as many Nights; and

" could have done it (εἰς τὸ διωκεῖς) for ever.
 " Wherefore then is he hungry? that he might
 " shew, he had assumed in truth (καὶ ἀλη-
 " θειαν) a Body of the like Passions (ὁμοιοπα-
 " ρεῖς) with Men.

From this Expression in truth, I gather,
 that our Lord was very or perfect Man;
 which he could not be, if he had not an Hu-
 man Soul: as the good Father a little be-
 fore, " ἀνθρωπῶς ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος, a
 " Man consisting of Soul and Body. And
 Epistol. Interpol. ad Trallian. " He was
 " truly born, ἀληθῶς γέγονεν— And
 Epistol. ad Philadelph. " There is one on-
 " ly begotten Son, God the Word and Man
 " θεὸς λόγος καὶ ἀνθρωπῶς, where λόγος the
 Word can't be taken for the Human Rational
 Soul; but θεὸς λόγος signifies the whole Di-
 vine Nature, as ἀνθρωπῶς the whole Human;
 for if λόγος signifies the Human Rational
 Soul, why is ἀνθρωπῶς added distinct from
 that Soul, without which he is no Man?
 Besides, a little after, St. Ignatius affirms,
 " that the ψιλὸς ἀνθρωπῶς the mere Man
 " Christ, or Christ as he is mere Man, con-
 " sists of ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος Soul and Body;
 " and that his Person has another Nature al-
 " so, that he is God the only begotten, the
 " Wisdom, and Word λόγον of God. Here is
 a plain Distinction between λόγος the Divine,
 and ψυχὴ καὶ σῶμα the Human; by which the
 λόγος is excluded from being a Part or Ra-
 tional

tional Soul of the last. And, " God the
 " Word did dwell in a human Body, the Word
 " being in that, as the Soul is in the Body
 " (διὰ τὸ ἐνοικεῖν αὐτῷ) θεόν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀνθρωπείαν
 " ψυχὴν) * for that God, but not the Human
 " Soul is said to be ἐνοικεῖν in-dwelling. From
 which Words (and I believe they'll bear easily
 that Construction) 'tis plain, that the θεὸς λόγος
 was not, or did not supply the Place of the ἀν-
 θρωπεῖα ψυχὴ. And that the ἀνθρωπεῖα ψυχὴ
 signifies here not the sensitive but the rational,
 appears from the Similitude before; The Divine
 Nature or λόγος dwells in and is united to the
 Human, as the Soul dwells in and is united to
 the Body. There is no Similitude between the
 Divinity and the Soul sensitive or of a Brute.

Epist. ad Polyc. " Christ is called the
 " Son of God (ἄρχωνος ἐν χρόνῳ) with-
 " out time [as God, and if so, how can he
 have a Beginning?], " in time [as Man];
 " invisible [and here he is call'd, what our
 Heretick challenges us to shew in a most Pri-
 mitive Writer, p. 9.] " in his [Divine] Na-
 " ture, seen in the Flesh; impalpable, as being
 " without a Body; palpable in the Body; im-
 " passible as God [and therefore, since his
 Rational Soul did partake also of his Sufferings,
 the λόγος or Divine Nature could not supply
 the Place of that Soul] " passible as Man.

Epistol. Interpol. ad Ephes. " Our Physi-
 " cian is the only true God, unbegotten, unac-

* So *Vedelius*. Read Archb. *Usher's* Dissert. cap. 15.

" cessible,

“ cessible, &c. and we have a Physician our Lord
 “ Jesus Christ, the Son only begotten before Ages,
 “ the Word, &c. Where Aretius (Account of
 Gent. c. 14.) observes our Saviour is not exclu-
 ded from being our Physician, or the only true God.

Epistol. Interpol. ad Magnes. “ There is
 “ one God Almighty, who manifested himself
 “ through Jesus Christ his Son, who is his
 “ Word, not pronounced, but substantial, (ὁ
 “ ῥῆτος ἀλλ’ ἐσιώδης); for he is not the sound of
 “ articulate Speech (λαλιᾶς ἐνὰ ῥῆτι φωνήμα),
 “ but the begotten Substance of the Divine E-
 nergy or Power (ἐνεργείας θεϊκῆς ἐσία ἁγνῆ)
 “ who in all things pleased [his Father] that
 “ sent him. By which words ’tis plain that the
 Holy Man thought the Son to be of one Sub-
 stance with the Father ἐσία ἐνεργείας θεϊκῆς.
 As for ἐσία ἁγνῆ, Aretius in his Account of
 Gentilis (p. 97.) expounds it ὑπαρξίς, a subsistent
 Being, in opposition to φωνήμα a vocal sound.
 Read also Archbishop Usher’s Dissert. cap. 15.

Epist. Interpol. ad Ephes. “ Nothing is
 “ hidden from our Lord. Then Christ is om-
 niscient, as he is God; tho’, as Man, he
 knows not the Day of Judgment.

Epist. ad Antioch. “ Moses having said, the
 “ Lord thy God is one Lord, Deut. vi. 4.
 “ Mark xii. 29. and thereby preached the one
 “ and only God, acknowledged likewise our
 “ Lord, saying, Gen. xix. 24. The Lord rai-
 “ ned upon Sodom and Gomorrah from the
 “ Lord [יהוה מן יהוה] Jehovah from Jehovah]
 “ Fire and Brimstone. The name Lord is
 twice

twice repeated, and yet *יהוה אחד* the Lord is one: Therefore the Father and the Son are two Persons, but not two Lords.

That the Reader may see, that I am not singular in my Application of these Passages of Ignatius, I'll refer him to the 14th Chapter of Gentilis's brief Account, where Aretius writes the same, and observes, that Gentilis, (p. 101.) confounded the Proprieties of Christ's two Natures; which is the Error of this present Heretick. But Ignatius is very careful in distinguishing of them. "He was (saith he Epist. Interpol. ad Ephes.) God, yet appear'd as Man; he was Man, yet worked as God. And in Epist. ad Philip. He introduces our Lord speaking thus, "I am not *ἀντίθετος* contrary to God, I acknowledge his Super-eminency *ὑπερ-χρῶς*. I know the Father to be *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑμῶς* *ἁπλοῦς* the Author of my Nativity. These words Ignatius makes our Lord pronounce to the Devil, when he tempted him; and therefore the *ὑπερ-χρῶς* Super-eminency there mentioned is with relation to Christ's Human Nature.

Our Arian's gross Mistakes proceed likewise from his confounding Christ's two Natures; as when he perverts this Text, My Father is greater than I, by transferring to the Divine, what by no means belongs to it, as is plain from what goes next before. John xiv. 28. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father, for my Father is greater than I. All this belongs to our Saviour's State
of

of Humiliation, for as he is God, he is always with the Father, and therefore can't be said to go to the Father. St. Chrysostom notes that herein our Saviour condescends to the weakness of his Apostles's Apprehension; as if he had said, Be not afraid for me, for I go to the Father, who, as he is greater, so is also able to remove all hardships, [λύσαι τὰ δειρά. Nothing hard δειρὸν or grievous could happen to Christ's Divinity]. So in another place, Mat. xxvi. 53. Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he'll give me more than twelve Legions of Angels. This is spoken according to the capacity ἐκείνων or guess of the Hearers, who had an Opinion of him as of a Man. For could he want the help of Angels, who with a single Question threw to the ground the Band and Officers, which came to seize him, John xviii. 3, 6? And if any should say, that the Father is greater than he, καὶ ὁ ἄριστος ἢ ἡμεῖς, as he is Principium Filiationis, the Principle of the Sonship, we would not contradict it, so that he did not make the Son to be ἐτερος ὅσις of another Substance. Thus St. Chrysostom, who is far from favouring the Inference, which the Arians would draw from this Text.

Calvin writes that there is no reason for referring this to Christ's Divine Nature with the Arians; nor need of applying it to his Human, as some Orthodox Fathers, in answer to those Hereticks: but that this is according to what

what our Infirmitie can bear, and that he, as it were, places himself between us and God: and that they ought to rejoyce, because he return'd to God, to which he was to unite them. He compares not his Father's Divinity with his, nor his Human Nature with his Father's Divine Essence; but rather his present State with that Celestial Glory, into which he was to be receiv'd. Thus also Beza; who allows notwithstanding, that to refer it to the Human Nature, as some do; or to the Dignity and Order of the Father's Personality, as others, is a sufficient Answer to the Arians, if they were not past Conviction. For my part, Calvin writes that the Orthodox Fathers expound it of the Humanity; and I had rather embrace their Interpretation.

Thirdly, Justin Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho hath, " This God, who is said to have appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, is another *ἑνός* from that God, who has made all things, [but he adds] in number *ἀριθμῶ*, I mean, not *γνώμην* in mind. From which words it is obvious, that the *ἑνότης* affects the Persons, wherein there is number *ἀριθμῶς*, and which are numerically different; not the Divinity, which is one *γνώμην*, or one mind. The Reader may meet with more out of this Christian Philosopher in the 13th Chapter of Aretius's Account of Valentinus Gētilis.

Our Heretick brags much of Primitive Christianity, and the most Primitive Writers; but I can meet yet with nothing, which favours his Heterodoxies in these two Apostolick ancient Authors, Ignatius and Justin; among those of their Works, which he himself can't except against. I shall leave these, and others to be examined by some, who have more leisure and ability.

He [p. 45.] inveighs against ancient Hereticks, particularly Tertullian, for changing the Arian Doctrines, which he boldly affirms (and I as boldly challenge him to prove it, as I from Scripture have done the contrary) to be those deliver'd by our Saviour, his Apostles, and all the first Christians.

He may well fall out with Tertullian, who (as my Lord of Worcester p. 33. takes notice) argues against Praxeas, cap. 25. from 1 John v. 7. qui tres unum sunt, non unus; as Praxeas would have it, that the Father and the Son were but one Person. By which Quotation, as well as from St. Cyprian, the Bishop proves the undoubted Authority of that Text; referring him besides to Dr. Mill's New Testament, and his various readings on that place. Yet he in his Answer to this Prelate's Letter affirms (with the like boldness and as little ground as before) that Tertullian [p. 49.] plainly never saw that Text. Whence did he quote it, if he had not seen it? Tertullian

tullian indeed was no Favourer of his Opinions, as is clear from the following places, Advers. Prax. cap. 2. εἰς τριότητα Sacramentum Unitatem in Trinitatem disponit, tres dirigens, Patrem & Filium & Spiritum Sanctum. Tres autem non statu, sed gradu; nec substantiâ, sed formâ; nec potestate, sed specie; unius autem substantiæ, & unius statûs, & unius potestatis; quia unus Deus, ex quo & gradus isti & formæ & species in nomine Patris & Filii & Spiritûs Sancti deputantur. Apologet. cap. 21. Λόγον didicimus Filium Dei & Deum dictum ex unitate substantiæ—De Deo Deus, ut lumen de lumine — quod de Deo profectum, Deus est & Dei Filius, & unus ambo. *I shall not here enlarge, tho' I might. I know, that Tertullian fell into Heresy; but still where that Heresy is not touched in his Writings, there we have reason to believe him to write according to the Orthodoxy of his Time.*

If he should reject the Testimonies of Tertullian, as an Heretick, I have the same Objection against Novatian, whose Treatise of the Trinity [p. 12.] he so much values, as having by it been confirmed in his Opinion: in which Work he observes the word Trinity not to be found; and 'tis very probable he likes it the better for that. But however none does more assert the Divinity, and the distinction of the two Natures of our Saviour, (Chap. 11, 12,

xxxvii Historical Preface.

13, 14, 15, 16.) *And if from several Expressions, (Chap. 17. 22, 26. Ante carnis assumptionem in omnibus rebus obedientiam præstitit — and Dum accipit sanctificationem à Patre, Patre minor est — and — Patri subditus & adnunciator voluntatis Paternæ — &c.) he seems to favour him (tho' the two last just now mention'd plainly refer to Christ's Humanity), yet he (Chap. 31.) denies that Christ's Divinity had any beginning, and that there is any Inequality. Qui ante omne tempus est, semper in Patre fuisse dicendus est. Nec enim tempus illi assignari potest, qui ante tempus est. Semper enim in Patre, ne Pater non semper sit Pater. — substantia illa Divina, cujus nomen est Verbum — cujus sic Divinitas traditur, ut non aut dissonantia aut inæqualitas Divinitatis duos Deos reddidisse videatur. And even often, when he writes any thing, which might look t'other way, he qualifies and softens the Expression by quâdam ratione, quodam modo or aliquo pacto; as (chap. 31.) Pater illum etiam quâdam ratione præcedit, quod necesse est quodammodo prior sit, quâ Pater sit; quoniam aliquo pacto antecedit necesse est eum qui habet originem, ille qui originem nescit. By which we may guess, how afraid he was of giving way to an Inequality, or a Priority and Posteriority in the Godhead, while he affirmed (as we do in the Athanasian Creed) that the
Father*

Father is made of none, *but* that the Son is of the Father. Deus Pater originem nesciens, Filius quicquid est, ex Patre est, Patri suo originem debens. *For as we have no thoughts adequate to comprehend this Mystery, how God the Son is of God the Father; so neither have we words, how to express it.* Novatian in the forecited Treatise affirms, Chap. 7. that every Spirit is a Creature. Chap. 24. that the Paraclet is less than Christ. *And neither* Chap. 29. *nor any where, calls the Holy Ghost God.* Therefore St. Hierom in his Apolog. advers. Ruffin. writes that this Book of Novatian, falsely ascribed to Cyprian and Tertullian, was read by the Hereticks of the Macedonian Party. Thence his Treatise is often join'd to Tertullian's Works. However, what I quoted out of him against our Heretick, is of force, since (as this Novatian himself saith, Chap. 18.) firmum est probationis genus, quod etiam ab Adversario sumitur.

I shall, as he [p. 9.] proposes several Questions to the Consideration of the Learned, propose also a few, as plain ones, to him.

I. Where, in the Scripture or most Primitive Writers, read we the Object of our Divine Worship express'd by the plural name Gods, Θεοι; or where in the Old Testament
is

is אלהים in that Signification join'd with a plural ?

II. Where read we, that a greater degree of Worship is to be paid to the Son than to the Father ? And that Glory is less belonging to the Son than to the Father ?

III. Where is the πνεῦμα or rational Human Soul of Christ call'd the Λόγος or Word ?

IV. Whether Christ had not two distinct Natures ? And whether one had not some things, which could not belong to another ? and whether we ought to attribute to the one that, which can't belong but to the other ?

V. If he allows the Holy Ghost to be neither God nor Lord, why does he [p. 46.] allow him Worship any more than Invocation ? Is he an Angel, or such a created Spirit ? Are not we forbidden the worshipping of Angels (Col. ii. 18. Apocal. xix. 10.) ? Is the Holy Ghost a Person ? If he be, is he a Divine, Angelical, or Human Person ?

VI. Whether or no we can be saved by the Holy Scripture we have already in our Hands ? and whether we ought to admit for sacred, what is represented to us as
fa-

favouring Opinions, which are contrary to that?

I shall not multiply Questions besides what seems pertinent to this present Dispute; but after a long and necessary Digression (wherein I have given a view of most things in this Author's Preface, together with some Remarks upon them) draw to a conclusion of mine, and return to the Order of my designed History.

Having first read this Historical Preface somewhat hastily, I perceived the drift of the Author; and then resolved to read it over more attentively, not out of mere Curiosity, as I did at first; but out of a desire to weigh, what force might lay in his Arguments; and to try, whether I were strong enough to justify my Faith in these mysterious Points, without acquiescing wholly in the Authority of the Church, backed however with some Passages of Scriptures, which, when I was taught the Principles of Religion, had by catechising been communicated unto me. Yet before I set my self upon this Trial, in an Article of so much Difficulty and Mysteriousness, I resolved, if I should find my Reason puzzled (I mean, in answering, with satisfaction to my self, this Man's Arguments; for otherwise I know the depth of these Mysteries must puzzle the ablest human Reason, or else they were no longer My-

Mysteries) to cast my self entirely upon the Determination of the Church; it being very improbable and almost next to impossibility, that the Consent of the whole Church for so many Ages should have been on the wrong side, and one single Man on the right. Is it to be believed that our Lord and his Holy Ghost should these many Centuries have forsaken and left the entire Body of the Catholick Church in the dark, and now at last revealed these new Discoveries to one Person? What? Is he alone inspired, and sent as a new Prophet? What Witness does he bring, what Miracles shews he to give credit to this extraordinary Mission? This strong and unanswerable Argument I kept in reserve, that my Faith might not be shaken. Besides I had another Refuge to secure my Retreat, that, tho' I might fail in encountering an Heretick, yet this might not proceed from the Weakness of the Cause so successfully managed and supported long before and since by several learned Fathers and Divines, but much rather from my unskilfulness in those ancient Ecclesiastical Writings and Records, to which, next to the Scriptures, Appeal is wont to be made in Matters of Religion; as also from my not being so expert a Textuary (as they term it), as Divines, who make it their whole Study fully to acquaint themselves with that Spiritual Arsenal; out of which the Primitive Fathers (as is admirably

rably seen in their Writings) with great Readiness of Wit and Dexterity fetched up-on all Occasions, fit Weapons to oppose any Heresy whatsoever. Being thus guarded at all Adventures, in my second reading of this Book, I made, as I went along, several Excerpta; and thence (that I might know what to encounter with) I summ'd up, from all those several Places where they lay scattered, the chief Heretical Assertions; and set them out, in their full Force, and (that I might deal fairly) in his own Words, referring all along to the Page of his Preface and Appendix. The Answers, which I have given, are all drawn from Scriptures, with Expositions here and there out of a few Fathers, more for Illustration than Confirmation; for my Want not only of Skill but of time, and a Fear of venturing too far out of my Depth, stopt me from undertaking that Work.

This Man concludes his Preface [p. 116.] by burlesquing a Text of St. Paul; for Scripture in the Mouth and Pen of an Heretick is seldom but turned into Ridicule and Blasphemy, *Corruptio optimi est pessima*. May I (writes he) be enabled so to beat under my own Body, with all its corrupt Affections, and bring them into Subjection, that when I have preached or proclaimed the pure and undefiled Religion of Christ to others, I may not my self become a Cast away. And I

pray God he may not ! for none certainly is more in danger of it than a Heretick or Messenger of Satan, when he takes upon him to be an Apostle. What Apostle can a Heretick be but a Judas ? Is not such a Preacher one of those wicked ones, to whom God says (Psal. l. 16, 17.) What hast thou to do to declare my Statutes, or to take my Covenant in thy Mouth ? May he rather be enabled to beat down his spiritual Pride, by which he has been betrayed into these Heresies ! May he be dispossessed of that enthusiastick Spirit, which has so far wrought upon him, that he asserts his Notions, with full and undoubted Evidence and an entire Satisfaction [Append. p. 35.] to be Part of the Revelation of God by his Son Christ Jesus ; and closes his Appendix by glorying, that he's persecuted for Righteousness Sake, and that the Blessing entailed upon such, the Kingdom of Heaven, does now plainly belong to him. Stubborn deluded Man ! Can one, who persecutes Christ, and cuts his Divine Eternity short, intitle himself to Heaven, and give out that he is persecuted for Righteousness Sake, because the University expelled him and his cursed Doctrine from among them ! I might instance in a great many such extravagant Expressions of Pride and Self-Conceit, which are scattered up and down his Book ; for indeed I had no time to remark minutely upon every particular : and if I had,
it

it would have swelled to a very large Volume, what I never intended should exceed the Bounds of his most daring and pestilent Preface. My Business was only to maintain the Articles, which are attack'd by his Heretical Tenets; not to pursue him through every Line of that virulent Discourse, which is all fraught with scurrilous and reviling Words upon the Church's sound and orthodox Doctrine. What I have asserted in the Maintainance of these Articles, I'll farther defend and make good, if there be Occasion; and tho' my Profession allows me very little time for these most serious and difficult Studies; yet I'll not come behind this Heretick in his Resolutions; and since he brags that he will (but I pray God he never may) venture even his Life in the Defence of Heresy, which is no other than the Devil's Cause; I'm ready to sacrifice my Health and (I trust in God's Grace) my Life also in the Defence of Orthodoxy, which certainly is God's Cause. 'Tis (which I'm sorry to hear) in many People's Mouths, that he's not to be minded, because he's mad. And Arius, and all the ancient Hereticks were mad too; and yet the Arian Madness was thought worth while to be enquir'd into, and check'd by above 300 Fathers and an Emperor at their Head. I look upon this Excuse of Madness to be an Artifice of the Enemies of Christianity, that this Devilish Poison being on that Pretence neglected

glected may, under a general Silence and Impunity, do what Execution is designed against our poor Church. Therefore I wish that this trifling or rather insidious Excuse may not prevail; but that some able Person, out of a laudable Concern, that so good, so great a Cause should be but weakly, and not as it deserves, managed by me, may take it into his own Hands; and leave me the Satisfaction of having publicly declared my good Will, and exposed myself, with all my Imperfections, in order to do, what Service, in my private Station, I was able, to that Church, of which, through God's Assistance, I shall ever profess myself a faithful, tho' unworthy Member.

I own both freely and truly, that nothing is by me more earnestly desir'd or pray'd for, than this Man's Conversion and Return to the Unity of the Faith and Communion of the Church, which he endeavours to rend by broaching or renewing these Heresies. My Duty is, ever to pray, with our Church, that God would have Mercy upon all Hereticks, and take from them all Hardness of Heart, and Contempt of his Word, and so fetch them home to his Flock, that they may be saved among the true Israelites.

I have taken what Care I was able, to keep my Pen clean from any reviling Language: I have no Manner of Hatred or Bitterness against his Person: and therefore my
Expres-

Expressions are no other than what are due to an Heretick, and the Title of unanswerable, which he all along assumes to himself, in defiance of all Mankind.

I am far from having so great an Opinion of myself, or of this my hasty but honest Performance, as to think it can carry so much Conviction with it, and effect so wonderful a Change, as that of an Heretick into an Orthodox Christian: or be the happy Instrument of turning this Tide of Heresy. That noble and blessed Task is reserved for better and greater Pens: The Alarm has been already given and taken. What I have done therefore is meant by me only as a Pledge of my good Will toward that Work, which, tho' none be less able to forward, yet none shall rejoice more to see completed.

I have now given an Historical Account of my whole Proceeding in this Matter, as he has of his; and since his is none of the shortest, I hope the length of mine may be excused by thee, kind Reader; and so I recommend both it and the following Reply to thy favourable Construction; being, if I have unwarily in this difficult Dispute written any thing contrary to sound Doctrine, or the Faith of the Church of England, ready in as publick a manner to make my Recantation.

Now

Now to the ever blessed Trinity, three Persons of one Substance, Power, and Eternity; the Father, by whose Foreknowledge we are elected; His Son Jesus Christ, by whose Blood we are sprinkled; the Holy Spirit, through whom we are Sanctified (1 Pet. i. 2.): our one only God; be Blessing, Glory, Wisdom, Thanksgiving, Honour, Power, and Might (Revel. vii. 12.) for ever and ever. *Amen.*

A R E-

The leader is defined by excels Overlight
and, before he goes on, to verify them
Following ERATA, which, through
and, I concluded in coming the first

.. ..

The Reader is desired to excuse Oversights,
and, before he goes on, to rectifie these
following E R R A T A, which, through
hast, I overlook'd in correcting the Prefs.

P. L. Read.

Epist. 3. 2. *Prayer.*

Pref. 17. 5. *World.*

28. 22. *think'st.*

Reply. 8. 18. *τέτα.*

9. ult. *Assistance,*

23. 14. *ἐγώ εἰμι.*

25. 6. *προωτότον.*

33. 25. *μόνον.*

57. 18. *αἰών.*

61. 20. *before,*

66. 20. *αἶμα.*

22. *לנפש חיה*

78. 22. *Bishop of Worcester.*

79. 17. *and, without so much as a Censure, un-god.*

81. 22. *Father, only before.*

85. 17. *expelled.*



A REPLY

TO

Mr. WILLIAM WHISTON'S
Historical Preface.



HE Doctrine of this Heretick is chiefly *Arianism*, which he most blasphemously affirms, and pronounces to be most certainly the *Original Doctrine of Christ himself, of his holy Apostles, and of the most Primitive Christians*: [p. 7, 2, 13.] a Doctrine long ago confuted and condemned by the Fathers of the *Nicene Council*, whose Decisions in that Point have now for almost 1400 Years been generally followed by most Churches, tho'

B

of

of different Persuasions, in the Christian World.

The common Doctrines, which this Man opposeth, are by him impiously branded with the name of *Antichristianism*, which (as he saith) prevailed over Christendom by the means of the over-bearing Tyranny of the Church of Rome; which Doctrines he asserts to have no more Foundation in Scripture, and the most Primitive Antiquity, than Purgatory and Transubstantiation, [p. 8. 28, 85.] taking away the Cup, and praying in an unknown Tongue. [p. 11. 46.]

His principal Heresies are about the Trinity, Incarnation, and Canon of the Bible.

In relation to the first; he avers, That the one and only Supreme God of the Christians is no other than God the Father; that the original supreme Worship is due only to him; and that the Son is inferior as well as subordinate to him; and not equally omniscient with him; that he was begotten or created by the Father only before the World; and that therefore that sort of Eternity of the Son of God towards the latter part of the Second Century was plainly not a real Existence, as of a Son properly co-eternal with his Father, by a true eternal Generation; but rather by a metaphysick Existence in potentia, or in the like higher and sublimer manner in the Father, as his Wisdom or Word, before his real Creation or Generation; which real Creation or Generation was then ever supposed

sed a little before the Creation of the World; that that Generation or Production of the Son was voluntary, not necessary; that the Son is God, but not ab eterno; that the Father and the Son are nowhere in Scripture affirmed to be consubstantial and co-essential; that Christ nowhere in Scripture is called properly equal to the Father, nor by any of the known Titles of the supreme God; such as, God the Creator, the invisible God, the omnipotent God, the omniscient God, the great God, the true God, the blessed, or the blessed God, the eternal God, the one God, the only God, the living God, the good God, the God of Heaven, the God over all, the wise God, the immortal God, the Highest. [p. 7, 9, 63, 65, 82, 83. Append. p. 27.]

These monstrous Assertions against the Son of God he pretends to confirm by perverting several Texts of Holy Scripture; viz. *Matth.* xix. 16, 17. and xxiv. 36. *Mark* xiii. 32. *John* xiv. 28. and xvii. 3. *1 Corinth.* viii. 6. [p. 11. Append. p. 4, 27.] And by misinterpreting the first Article of the *Nicene Creed*, and our Church's Collect for the 18th Sunday after Trinity, [Append. p. 24, 25.]

Nor is he contented to have invaded the Second Person of the ever-blessed Trinity, and outdone the Devil himself, who confessed him, and trembled at his Presence, even when his Divine Majesty was (as it

were) eclipsed by human Flesh under the Form of a Servant, *Matth. viii. 29. Mark iii. 11.*); but he proceeds to the third Person also, denying the *Consubstantiality and Co-equality of the Holy Ghost to the Father and the Son*; charging his *Invocation with Antichristianism*; asserting him to be *inferiour and subordinate to both Father and Son, and no where in Scripture directly call'd God or Lord*; and that no Christian till some time after the Council of Nice, ventur'd to invoke him. [p. 10, 28, 65.]

Having thus with a boldness unparallel'd and unheard of for many Ages, stripp'd two Persons of the Trinity of their Godhead, he explodes the *Mystery of Three Divine Persons being one in Substance and Divinity*; refuses to read the third and fourth Petitions of our Litany; challenging the *Orthodox to shew any one Testimony before Athanasius* (whom he characterizeth as the greatest Impostor and Knave) *that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one God, or the one God of the Christian Religion.* [p. 64, 75, 98, to 108. Append. p. 9, 30.]

Therefore being ask'd whether he could not join in our Doxology, *To Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, one God whom we adore*; he replied, *he would be a Turk as soon, and added, That's a rash Expression; but I mean that this Language is so entirely contrary to the Nature of Christian Religion, that I can't*

go into't for any Consideration whatsoever
[p. 83, 109. Append. p. 6, 27.]

He owns the *Arian* Heretick *Eunomius's* Creed to be true; but the *Atbanasian*, (wherein the Trinity in Unity and the Unity in Trinity is asserted to be the Object of the Christian Catholick Faith and Worship) is by him under the name of *Vigilius's* Creed reviled and scurrilously abused, as a gross Corruption composed under and established by the *Antichristian Church*; the continuation of which is a great shame to all Protestants, and a pollution of God's sacred Worship; false and ungrounded; not to be read or join'd with but dubitante, if not, renitente conscientia; than which he believes nothing in the *Antichristian Church* her self more unjustifiable. [p. 16, 27, 63, 69.]

His next Heresy is, that at the Incarnation the λόγος (the Word) supplied the place of the human or rational Soul.

These are the Particulars of his Heresy in relation to the Holy Trinity and Incarnation. I proceed lastly, to those concerning the Canon of Holy Scripture.

Our *Arian* having modelled and coined a new Faith, or rather botched up and revived many Arch-Hereticks's old ones, (for Heresy, like the *Hydra's* Heads, ever multiplies by its rising again) adviseth himself to do, what his Predecessors were never so bold as to attempt; that is, to raise a new Gospel, and

and with it prop his doubty Faith. He pretends to new Discoveries, strange and contrary to the general Belief of Christians in those latter Ages; surprizing to the Ears even of the most Learned; against the established Doctrines and Practices not only of this, but of almost all the other Christian Churches. [p. 1. 85.]

The new Bible he has discover'd contains, The Apostolical Constitutions and the Doctrine of the Apostles; which he proposes to prove to be sacred Books of the New Testament; and the former of them the most sacred of the Canonical Books; in Authority, equal to the four Gospels themselves, and superiour to the Epistles of single Apostles; which tho' the Antichristian Church has so long laid aside as Spurious and Heretical, yet are no other than the original Laws and Doctrines of the Gospel; out of which a learned Friend shewed him several Passages favourable to the Arian Opinion; and though there be an Interpolation of a Passage, which proves Adoration to be due to the Holy Ghost, yet it affects no more the Body of the Constitutions, than that gross Interpolation in St. John's first Epistle does affect that whole Epistle, or the rest of the Books of the New Testament. [p. 12, 13, 35, 47, 48, 85, 115. Append. p. 27.] and tho' the Sixth Article of the Church of England owns all the Canonical Books the Church then knew; yet had more been known, they had been set down;

Josephus was a great Christian; and his writings are not

not is it affirmed there, that there are no more. [Append. p. 27.]

This is our Discoverer, and his New Gospel; for the Old one (as will appear farther in this Discourse) favours not his Discoveries, witness his rejecting the great Evangelist and beloved Apostle St. John's Text, in his first Epistle concerning the Unity in Trinity; of which more afterward. Well may this Disturber of the Peace of Christianity call for necessary Alterations to be made in the Articles, Creed, and Liturgy of our Church [p. 75.]; when he has alter'd the Canon of our Bible, on which those are founded: Well may he impose a new Creed, and obtrude a new Form of Baptism upon us [p. 63, 94, 95. p. 89, to 98.] and practise it himself barbarously on a poor Infant a little above half a Year ago [p. 89.] when he having rejected the eternal one, has forged a new Trinity to be baptized into, and incurred the Curse of the Apostle St. Paul, Gal. i. 8. *But though we or an Angel from Heaven preach any other Gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.*

A modern but very learned Writer has most truly observed, " That the Catholick Church always looked upon these εὐνοη-
 " Men as so many Pests, which are ventu-
 " rous, meddling, Self-opiniators, and In-
 " novators in sacred Points, in which all
 " In-

“ Innovation ever was, and is, and ought
 “ to be intolerable; such were *Arius*, *Ma-*
 “ *cedonius*, *Nestorius*, and *Eutyches* in the se-
 “ veral Ages they lived in.

This excellent and pious Divine seasonably and successfully employed his Pen to confute the Heresy of *Three distinct Infinite Minds in the Trinity*, then by some maintained in Print and preached in the Pulpit. Yet these could not value themselves upon their being the first Founders of these Opinions; for they only licked the Spittle, and raked up the dregs of preceding Hereticks, as of *Valentinus Gentilis* (of which more by and by); and he of the ancient Heresiarchs mention'd by *Timotheus* Presbyter of *Constantinople*. Τελείται, οἱ δεχόμενοι τὴν φιλόπονον ἰωάννην, καὶ τὰ τέσσα συλεσμένα; ὑμῶν καὶ φύσεις τρεῖς μεμενέαι ὅτι τὸ ἅγιον τέλει δὲ βλασφημῶσι. Now to shew how one Heresy draws ever many more after it, this *Valentinus Gentilis* held not only, that ^b the
 “ Father, Son and Holy Ghost, have three
 “ distinct Essences or Substances, and that
 “ there are in the Trinity three eternal Spi-
 “ rits; but also that the Father alone is that
 “ one only God set forth to us in Holy Scri-
 “ pture, that the Son is subordinate to the

^a Τιμοθέου λόγος περὶ τῶν προσερχομένων τῇ ἀγίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ. published by Meursius among his Auctores Theologi Græci Varii. Ann. 1619.

^b A short History of Valentinus Gentilis Lond. 1696.

“ Father as to his Maker ; and therefore
 “ calls the Trinity a mere human Invention,
 “ not so much as known to any Catholick
 “ Creed, and directly contrary to the Word
 “ of God.

This is exactly the Doctrine of our present Heretick, who [p. 8.] voucheth (lest we should think him to be an Original) Dr. Pain, as his Precedent, *who began to see the Falshead of the common Opinions in these Matters, and was in great danger of suffering for his boldness in saying so.* And that I may not pass him by without taking some notice of his *boldness* ; this Dr. Pain was Prebendary of *Westminster*, and I heard him preach (twice, I think) upon 1 *Corinth.* viii. 6. from which Text with great vehemency he endeavour'd to conclude *the Father to be the only one God* exclusive of the Son. The time when it was done, aggravates his *Impudence*, for 'twas on *Trinity-Sunday* (1694.) and without any Concern he received the Holy Sacrament the same Day, whereon our Church directs the *Athanasian* Creed to be read, and a Collect and Preface to be used ; which all sufficiently check that erroneous Opinion.

Having, as plainly as I can, set out this Man's Tenets in his own Words, and withal given some short account of his Heretical Pedigree and Relations ; I will, by God's Assistance, attempt a brief Answer, confining it

to Scripture-proofs only : since my Lay-capacity and Calling have not put me under an Obligation, nor afforded me the happy leisure of acquainting my self fully with the Writings of the Fathers, and other Monuments of Ecclesiastical Authority. This, if it be thought necessary, will, I hope, be performed by some able Clergy-man, (moved by a pious Zeal for God's Glory, his eternal Truth, and the Peace of his Church); tho' I can't help thinking but that the Word of God may afford such Weapons, which if managed by an expert hand, might confound the most Gigantick Heresy whatsoever : Our Saviour himself made use of no other to baffle the Devil, that old Serpent and first Author of Heresy : In short, what *David* said of *Goliath's* Sword, may be applied in this case ; *There is none like that, give it me,* 1 Sam. xxi. 9.

In this Reply, I'll observe the Order, wherein I have placed his Opinions : And first in opposition to what he writes against the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, I lay down the following Proposition.

God the Son is equal to God the Father, uncreated, really existing, and begotten by him from all Eternity ; and therefore by a necessary Generation ; coeternal, consubstantial, and coessential with him. Partaker of all the known Titles of the

the Supreme God, and having a just Title to the same Supreme Worship.

This Equality is asserted by St. Paul, Phil.

2. 5. *Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God, thought it not Robbery to be Equal with God.* Colof. 2. 9. *In him dwelleth all the Fulness of the Godhead bodily.* If then God the Father be *more God* than he, *all the fulness of the Godhead* can't be said to dwell in him. The Adverb *σωματικῶς* Bodily, is understood by Dr. Hammond to mean *really and substantially*. S. Hierom renders it, *the whole fullness of the Godhead dwelleth in his Body*. It may therefore signifie, that there is a perfect Hypostatick Union between his two Natures; the Fulness of the Godhead being personally united to the Human Nature of his Body; which Union is admirably expressed in the *Athanasian Creed*: *Perfect God and perfect Man, of a reasonable Soul and human Flesh subsisting; One, not by confusion of Substance, but by Unity of Person.* Here is the Perfect God, *πᾶν τὸ πλῆρωμα τὸ θεόπ-
τερον*, and the Perfect Man *σωματικῶς*, and the Personal Union denoted in the Word *κα-
τοικεῖ*.

Again in this same Chapter, v. 9. he is called *the Head of all Principality and Power*, *κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας*; which he could not be, if he was subordinate and inferior to the Father. Therefore from this Text St. Chry-

Joseph makes this Inference; ὁ μόνος ἀπάντων, ἡ αἰτία, καὶ ὁ κτίστης, ὁ μόνος ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡγεμονία. *He who is above all, the cause of all Principality and Power, is he not also of the same Substance with the Father?*

This Mystery of the Divine Unity and Equality was a stumbling Block to the unbelieving *Jews*, who (John v. 18.) *did seek the more to kill our Saviour, because he said that God was his Father, making himself equal with God.* And (John x. 30.) he having said, *I and my Father are one, they took up Stones again to stone him.* And worse and much more inexcusable than those *Jews*, are those Hereticks among us Christians, who, after such a clear and so long a Manifestation of the Gospel, shut their Eyes against demonstrative Conviction (for Revelation in Divine Matters is Demonstration), and still deny the Equality and Unity of the Godhead of the Father and the Son.

God the Son (besides that he is no where in Scripture said to be *created*, but always *begot*) can't be called *created*, or a *Creature*, for then he could not be *God*, which is an *Infinite Being*, having neither beginning nor ending. But we read in the Prophecy of *Micah* v. 2, (appropriated to our Saviour, *Matth.* ii. 6.) that *his goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.* And in the Angel's Message to the Virgin *Mary*, *Luke* i. 33. that *he should reign over the House of Jacob*

*Jacob for ever; and that of his Kingdom there should be no end. He therefore was very exactly typified under Melchisedech, who is observ'd by the Apostle to the Hebr. vii. 3. to be made like unto the Son of God, because (his Genealogy being not recorded) he was without Father, without Mother, without Descent, ἀρρεαλόγῳ, having neither beginning of Days, nor end of Life; from whence it clearly follows, that the Son of God typified by him, has neither beginning of Days nor end of Life; and that tho' we have the Genealogy of his Human Generation recorded by two of the Evangelists, Βελα. Ἀποστόλ. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Matth. i. 1. Luc. iii. 24. Yet as to his Divine Nature and Birth, he is really and infinitely more truly than Melchisedech, (for all Christ's Types are by far outdone in the Substance) ἀρρεαλόγῳ without Descent; for ὃ ἡμεῖς αὐτοῦ τὴν διηγήσεται; who shall declare his Generation? Act. viii. 33. Esai. liii. 8. This Text of *Isaiab* I have here added only for Illustration, because I know the Ecclesiastical ^c Writers apply the Word ἡμεῖς to his Human as well as his Divine Generation; since the Mystery of his Incarnation, as well as that of his being begotten from everlasting by the Father, is incomprehensible; yet ^d St. Cyril of Jerusa-*

^c Hieron. Procop.

^d Catech. II.

Iem makes use of this Passage to prove the Eternity of his Divine Birth.

I shall farther make good the Equality of the Father and Son, because the two Persons are but one God; as is affirmed by our Saviour himself in his most divine Prayer to his Father recorded by St. *John*, c. xvii. v. 21. — *That they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee.* V. 22. *That they may be one, as we are one.* Nor does it invalidate the force of the Argument, that the Unity of Essence which I argue for in the Divine Persons, is not the same with that Unity of the Faithful, which our Saviour prays for to his Father, and which is only an Unity of Communion, or *the Communion of Saints*; because the Particle of Similitude *as* joins frequently in like cases two things, between which there can be no adequate proportion; e. g. *Matth.* v. 48. *Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father, which is in Heaven, is perfect.* Here is an absolute Command, and yet let the Perfectness of Man be never so great, 'tis impossible it should ever rise to the infinite Perfection of God. By this Particle *as*, a Pattern is set for our imitation, tho' still, after all our endeavours, we shall come but short of it. So in the other Text a Pattern of the most perfect Unity is set forth, which no other Unity whatsoever can equal: yet the Congregation of the Faithful are by
St.

St. Paul, *Ephes. iv. ver. 3, to ver. 7.* exhorted to keep the Unity of the Spirit, as one Body and one Spirit; and as an Argument he adds, there is one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God, and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all. In these Words of the Apostle the one Lord excludes not the one God and Father from being the one Lord, nor does the one God and Father exclude the one Lord from being the one God; and since the Unity is as perfect in the one Lord as in the one God, it must follow that the one Lord and the one God and Father is but one divine Being, tho' two distinct divine Persons. And therefore the Argument drawn by this Heretick, and his Acquaintance Dr. Pain in his Sermon before-mentioned from *1 Cor. viii. 6.* falls to the ground. The whole Context and Text run thus. *As concerning therefore the eating of those things that are offered in Sacrifice unto Idols, we know that an Idol is nothing in the World; and that there is none other God but one; for tho' there be that are called Gods whether in Heaven or in the Earth (as there be Gods many and Lords many) But to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him. If the word One joined to God the Father (as these Arians would have it) must exclude Lord Jesus Christ from being equally*

qually God with him, and places him in a lesser degree of *Godhead*; then by the same force of Argument and Connexion the word *One* joined to *Lord Jesus Christ* must exclude *God the Father* from being equally *Lord* with him, and places him in a lesser degree of Dominion; both which Inferences being absurd and evidently false, that the *Father* should not be *Lord*, and the *Son* should not be *God*, not only the inference of Inequality built upon these words is null; but besides it most conclusively follows, that since the *Father* is no less *Lord* than the *Son God*, and yet the word *One* is joined to *Lord* as well as *God*, therefore there must be an *Unity of Essence* in the *Godhead*; *the Lord and the God* is but *one Substance* or *Being*; but *the Father and Jesus Christ* are *two Persons*. I must here subjoin St. ^a *Hierom's* Observation on this Text: "As the Son taketh not away from
 " *God the Father* his being *Lord*, when
 " he is called *the one Lord*; so neither the
 " *Father* takes away from the *Son* his being
 " *God*, when he is called *the one God*. We
 " read in another place, (*Psal. c. ver. 3.*)
 " *Know ye that the Lord, he is God*; and
 " elsewhere (*Deut. vi. ver. 4.*) *the Lord*
 " *our God is one Lord*. If therefore, as the
 " *Arians* think, *God the Father* is *the only*

^a Read his Notes on *Ephes. c. 4. v. 3.*

" God, by the same consequence, Jesus
 " Christ will be *the only Lord*; and nei-
 " ther the Father will be Lord, nor the
 " Son God: But far be it that either the
 " Godhead should be wanting in the Domi-
 " nion, or the Dominion in the Godhead:
 " There is one Lord, and one God, because
 " the Dominion of the Father and Son is
 " but one Divinity.

Thus irrefragably argues this learned
 holy Man: And the most resolute Hero-
 tick must needs submit to the clear light
 of this Passage of St. Paul, and be afraid as
 well as ashamed thus blasphemously to di-
 vide the Godhead, which is the most per-
 fect Unity, and the Fountain of all o-
 thers: But Hereticks make good the Say-
 ing of St. Peter (2 Pet. iii. 16.) by wresting
 St. Paul's, as they do also other Scriptures,
 unto their own destruction.

Melchisedech (whereof I made mention
 before) was a Type of Christ's Priesthood:
Thou art a Priest for ever after the Order of
Melchisedech, Psal. cx. 4. Hebr. vii. 17.
 This our High-Priest therefore has *neither*
beginning of days nor end of life; who by
 his own blood has obtained eternal redem-
 ption for us, Hebr. ix. 12. and is the propi-
 tiation for our sins, 1 John ii. 1. Such an
 High-Priest became us, Hebr. vii. 26. Man
 had offended God, an Infinite Being: and
 that the price of our Redemption might bear

a full proportion to the Offence and the offended (οὐθέν εἰς τὸ πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνες ἵνα σώσῃ τοὺς πάντας, Heb. vii. 25.) an Infinite Being was to pay that Price (αἰώνιον λύτρωσιν, an everlasting and infinite Price, Hebr. ix. 12); and such a one is our Saviour, who, if he had had a beginning, had not been infinite: And therefore he was begotten from everlasting, and consequently not created; for Creation necessarily implieth a Beginning. Besides, if God the Son be begotten of God the Father, he can't be said to be created by him. "Hear O Arius! (saith St. Hieron.) Hear, Eunomius, if the Lord is a Creature, if he is made, does the Artificer beget his Work? Does he call his Work his Son? &c. "There are which are adopted Sons; As "many as received him, to them he gave power to become the Sons of God, (John i. 12. "by Adoption, υἱοθεσία, Rom. viii. 15. not "by Nature, φύσει or ὁμοῦσι, as Christ ὁμοῦς "Sons the only-begotten, John i. 18.) but "he is begotten of the Father's Nature and "Substance.

The only-begotten Son of God is equally Partaker with his Father of all the known Titles of the Supreme God.

The incommunicable Title of *Jehovah*, *I am*, and *Jah*, יהוה יהוה יהוה is given in Scripture to God the Son. That these three

I shall now shew these three Names to be equally bestowed on God the Son; and first for *Jehovah*. The Prophecy of *Malachi*, c. 4. v. 5, 6. is by our Saviour appropriated to St. *John* the *Baptist*, Matth. xi. 14. as well as by the Angel in his Message to *Zachary* the *Baptist's* Father, *Luc.* i. 17. In this Prophecy, the *Baptist* under the Name of

D 3

Eliab (because he was to appear in *Eliab's* Spirit and Power, Luk. i. 17.) is said to be sent before the coming of the day of the Lord [יְהוָה *Jehovah*] which Lord is our Saviour the Son of God, whose Forerunner he was, *Matth. iii. 1, 11.* Again, *Malachi iii. 1.* Behold I will send my Messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me, i.e. before Christ, as it is explained and quoted, *Mark i. 2.* *Luke vii. 27.* *Isaiah xlii. c. 40. v. 3.* prophecies of the same, *The voice of him that crieth in the Wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord [יְהוָה *Jehovah*], make straight in the Desert a high way for our God,* which God and Lord was Christ, as it is attested by all four Evangelists, *Matth. iii. 3.* *Mark i. 3.* *Luke iii. 4.* *John i. 23.*

Besides, 'tis known to every one skilled in the Hebrew Language, that the Name *JEHOVAH* יְהוָה comprehendeth in it the three Tenses, *present, passed, and to come*; the Name *JAH* יָ is an Abbreviation of *Jehovah*; the Name *יהוה* is render'd by *אני* and *אני* I AM. In the New Testament (the Greek Language in its Idiom differing from, and not so emphatical as the Hebrew) the three Tenses included in the Name *Jehovah*, of which *Jah* is but an Abbreviation, and *Eliab* but one Tense, are expressed by three words, *ὁ ἄν, καὶ ὁ νῦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, which Epithet is given to the Lord God Almighty, *Apoc. xi. 17.* and taken by our Saviour, *Apoc. i. 8.*

i. 8. *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, which was, and which is to come.* The same Epithet is given to God the Father, (*Apoc. iv. 8.*) or to him, *that sat on the Throne, (v. 9.)* The same is repeated (only *ὁ ὢν, ὁ ἔρχόμενος, ὁ ἔσθης* which shall be, for *ὁ ἔρχόμενος, ὁ ἔσθης* which is to come) *Apoc. c. 16. v. 5.* Our Saviour, the Messiah, was known by the Name of *ὁ ἔρχόμενος*, (not improperly answering to the Hebrew *הַבָּרִךְ*), *art thou He that should come, or look we for another?* *Match. xi. 3.* Before I quit this Topic, I shall draw some few Inferences from it, whereby our Saviour's Divinity being from all Eternity will farther appear.

I. In the Name *Jehovah*, the Note of each Tense is *Infinite*; which is always, which was from everlasting, and will be for ever. The same is by consequence to be understood of *ὁ ὢν, ὁ ἔμν, ὁ ἔρχόμενος*, or *ἔσθης*; for if *Infinity* be not added to each Tense, where will the difference be between the Creator and his Creatures? for this treble Distinction of Time occurreth in created Beings; as the Angels may be said to have been, to be, and about to be; but the Creator has this peculiar to himself, that what in the Creatures is *finite*, in him is *infinite*; as when an Angel is said to have been, we are to understand that the time, during which he has been, is limited; but if we read of God, that he hath been, we must believe

believe that he *has been from all Eternity*. Since therefore our Saviour, as well as his Father, is called Jehovah, and the Time *past* included in that word must be understood to be *infinite*: Therefore whatever in Holy Writ is affirmed of our Saviour in the Time *past* in respect to his Divinity, must also be understood to be *Infinite*, and *from all Eternity*. V. G. When Christ in his Prayer, *John xvii. 5.* saith, *Glorifie thou me with thy own self, with the Glory, which I had with thee before the World was*; and *v. 24.* *Thou lovedst me before the Foundation of the World*; and *v. 8.* *I came out from thee*: We must believe, that his Glory, his Father's Love, his Coming forth from the Father, is from everlasting. So when *St. John, c. i. v. 1.* writeth, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God*; we must believe, that the Son's Existence was in the beginning before ever the World was created, and that he was with his Father from all Eternity. Thus *Apoc. i. 17.* *I am the first and the last*; and *Apoc. i. 8. & xxi. 6.* he is called the *beginning and the ending*; the *beginning*, because he is the *beginning* of all things; *ὁ ἀρχὴ*, *Col. i. 18.* and therefore before all things, and without beginning himself: the *ending*, because he out-lasteth all things: *They shall perish, but thou shalt endure; thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail*; *Pfal.*

Pfal. cii. v. 26, 27. Heb. i. 11, 12. *Jesus Christ the same yesterday and to day and for ever*, Heb. xiii. 8. which is but another expression for *ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ὡν, καὶ ὁ ἐσόμενος*, which *was, is, and shall be*. The word *Yesterday* is not to be taken in a limited Sense in respect of an *Infinite Being*, in whose sight a *thousand Years* are but as *yesterday*, Psal. xc. 4. to whom all Time is present; and therefore our Lord told the *Jews* (John viii. 58.) *Verily, verily* (with a double Affelevation confirming his Divinity) *I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am*; *ἔγω εἰμι*. Where it is very remarkable, that he does not say, *I was*, but *I am*; to shew not only the *Eternity* but the *Immutability* of his Divine Nature. A thousand Years and more since *Abraham* was born, were but as one Day, and present to him. When God the Father saith, *Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee*, Hebr. i. 5. Psal. 2. 7. The Word *this Day* is no limitation to him *who inhabiteth Eternity*, Isai. lviii. 13. *with whom one day is as a thousand Years, and a thousand Years as one day*, 2 Pet. iii. 8. God's Day is no other but *Eternity*, and therefore he begot his Son *from all Eternity*; his Son is *Coeternal* and *Coequal* with him. St. *Augustin* takes that Text of the second Psalm, to signify the Divine Generation of our Saviour from all Eternity.

2. Having proved by Scripture that the Son is equally with the Father Partaker of the Name *Jehovah*; since the Name by its original Signification (as has also been made out by the Greek Translation of it, both by the Pen-men of the New Testament, and the Interpreters of the Old) denotes the *τὸ ὄν* or *ὄντα*, the *Being, Essence, or Substance* of the Godhead: I may very reasonably conclude from the very Text of Holy Scripture the *τὸ ὁμοούσιον*, the *Coeffentiality and Consubstantiality* of the Father and the Son.

Tho' the Proof of the Name *Jehovah's* being the Name of God the Son as well as of God the Father, is sufficient to conclude, that all other Supreme Titles of the Godhead belonging to *Jehovah*, do consequently belong to God the Son; yet for Illustration, and a farther Confutation of this Heretick, I'll give out of many, which might be brought, a few more Instances.

E. G. In the Creed, the Titles of *Almighty*, and *Maker, or Creator of Heaven and Earth*, are given to God the Father, but no more exclusive of God the Son, than the Title of *Lord* in the Creed given to God the Son, is exclusive of God the Father. Christ is call'd *The Almighty*, *ὁ παντοκράτωρ*, *Apocal. i. 8.* He is said *to have made all things*, *John i. 1, 2. to uphold all things by the word of his Power*, *Hebr. i. 3.*

I shall

I shall here insert a Text out of Coloss. i. 12, 15, 16, 17, 18. — Giving thanks unto the Father — who has translated us into the Kingdom of his dear Son — who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every Creature ($\omega\epsilon\lambda\omicron\tau\omicron\upsilon\alpha\theta\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\varsigma\ \chi\tau\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ — & Apoc. iii. 14. $\eta\ \alpha\rho\chi\eta\ \tau\ \chi\tau\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \tau\ \theta\epsilon\omicron$, the beginning of the Creation of God; not that he was created, for then how could he be first begotten? but because $\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\rho\chi\eta\ \eta\nu\ \omicron\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron$ in the beginning was the Word, and therefore he is the $\alpha\rho\chi\eta$ the beginning, as well as the ending of all things, Apoc. i. 8. & xxi. 6. & xxii. 13. And in the beginning $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\rho\chi\alpha\varsigma$ laid the Foundation of the Earth, Hebr. i. 10. And therefore it is farther explained in the Text by a Reason) For by him were all things created that are in Heaven, visible and invisible, whether Thrones or Dominions, or Principalities or Powers; all things were created by him and for him: And he is before all things, and by him all things consist, and he is the head of the Body, the Church: who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead ($\omega\pi\omega\tau\omicron\tau\alpha\theta\epsilon\ \epsilon\nu\ \tau\ \nu\epsilon\chi\rho\omega\nu$ — which St. Chrysostom expounds $\alpha\pi\alpha\rho\chi\eta\ \tau\ \alpha\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, The First-fruits of the Resurrection; as St. Paul 1 Cor. xv. 20. $\alpha\pi\alpha\rho\chi\eta\ \tau\ \kappa\epsilon\rho\gamma\iota\mu\eta\mu\epsilon\tau\omega\nu$ the First-fruits of them that slept.) That he in all things might have the Preeminence: for it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell. (And John i. 16. of his fulness have all we

received.) S. Chrysostom from this Text makes these Inferences. " If he is a Creature, how
 " is he the Image [εικων, & Heb. i. 3. the
 " express Image of the Person ~~πατριος~~ & ~~πα-
 " τερικος~~] of him who created him? If first-
 " born of every Creature signifies created first,
 " if he is in that sense First-born, then he
 " has Brothers, born of the same Essence
 " with him, which would be absurd to af-
 " firm of the Son of God. Christ himself,
 John xx. 17. saying, I ascend unto my Fa-
 ther and your Father, not our Father, shews
 the difference between his eternal Genera-
 tion, and our Creation and Adoption.

He is called The great God and our Lord
 Jesus Christ, Tit. ii. 13. Christ, who is over
 all, God blessed for ever, Rom. ix. 5.

God is Light, 1 John i. 5. and Christ is
 called That Light, John i. v. 7. the true
 Light, v. 9.

God the Father is called Lord holy and
 true, Apoc. vi. 10. So also is the Son, He
 that is Holy, he that is True, the Amen, the
 Faithful and true Witness, Apoc. iii. 7, 14.

'Tis therefore upon good Ground that the
 Church in the Nicene Creed teaches us to be-
 lieve in Jesus Christ, God of God, Light of
 Light, very God of very God, begotten, not
 made, being of one Substance with the Fa-
 ther, by whom all things were made.

God

God only knoweth the Hearts of Men,
 1 Reg. viii. 39. 2 Chron. vi. 30. Act. xv. 8.
 He tries the Reins and the Heart, Jer. xi. 20.
 Psal. vii. 9. So does God the Son: These
 things saith the Son of God—I am he that
 searcheth the Reins and the Heart, Apoc. ii.
 18, 23. Jesus knew all men, he knew what
 was in men, John ii. 24, 25. Jesus perceiving
 the thoughts of their Hearts—Luke ix. 47.
 Mark ii. 6, 8.

God is called the only Potentate, King of
 Kings, and Lord of Lords, which only bath Im-
 mortality, dwelling in the Light, which none
 can approach unto (*ἀπρόσβολου*) 1 Tim. vi. 15,
 16. Christ the Lamb is also named King of
 Kings, Lord of Lords, Apoc. xvii. 14. & xix.
 13, 16. The kingdoms of this world are be-
 come the kingdoms of our Lord (i.e. God the
 Father) and of his Christ (i.e. God the Son)
 Apoc. xi. 15. God the Son saith of himself,
 I am he that liveth, and was dead; and behold
 I am alive for evermore, Apoc. i. 18. Since the
 Light, wherein the Father dwelleth, is in-
 accessible, how can the Son be in the Father,
 and the Father in him, John xiv. 10. & xvii.
 23. unless God the Son were equal to God
 the Father? for else the Son would be ex-
 cluded by this word *ἀπρόσβολου*, which none
 can approach unto, if he were not the same
 God as his Father.

There is a very eminent Prophecy of our Saviour, containing many of his high Titles and Names, *Isai. ix. 6. For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the Government shall be upon his shoulders: and his Name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, (אל גבור), The everlasting Father, (אבי עד) The Prince of Peace, of the increase of his Government and Peace there shall be no end.* How many of these Titles can belong to none, but the high and supreme God? as *the mighty God, the everlasting Father; [Jerem. xxxii. 18. the great, the mighty God, great in Counsel, mighty in Work]* and in this last, 'tis worth observing, that the name of *Father* is even given to the *Son*. But yet as the Catholick Faith forbids us to *divide the Substance*, so likewise to *confound the Persons*. Therefore neither can the *Father* be call'd *Son*, nor the *Son* *Father*, with respect to the *Personality* in the ever blessed Trinity; but with respect to *created things*, the *Son* may be called $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\varsigma$ & $\alpha\iota\omega\acute{\nu}\alpha\varsigma$ or $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\alpha\iota\omega\acute{\nu}\alpha\varsigma$ (for *Eusebius Evangel. Demonstr. l. 7, and 9.* has both, quoting the first from *Symmachus's Translation*) because by him *the Worlds* ($\alpha\iota\omega\acute{\nu}\epsilon\varsigma$) were made, *Heb. i. 2.* as we call God *The Father of Heaven*, because he created, dwells in, and is Lord of it, *Gen. i. 1. Psal. cxxiii. 1. Matth. xi. 25. Thus 1 Tim. i. 17. τῆς βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων* ——— where the word

word *αἰώνιον* is render'd *eternal*, as in *Isaiab*, *everlasting*, by our learned Translators.

From what hath been hitherto quoted, it is plain, that God the Son equally with God the Father has *all the known* Titles of the supreme God: So true is that, which our Lord, who is *Truth* it self, *John* xiv. 6. speaks in his Prayer to his Father, *John* xvii. 6. *All mine are thine, and all thine are mine.* Thus also *God's Angels*, *John* i. 51. are called the *Angels of the Son of Man*, *Matth.* xxiv. 30. *God's Elect*, *Rom.* vii. 33. *his Elect*, *Mark* xiii. 27. *God's Church*, *1 Tim.* 8. 5. and the *Church of the living God*, *Id.* iii. 15. *his Church*, *Matth.* xvi. 18. *As the Father raises up the dead, and quickens them; so the Son quickens, whom he will*, *John* v. 21. The Power of *forgiving sins*, which belongs to God only, *Mark* ii. 7. belongs also to the *Son of Man*, *Ibid.* v. 10. who is also the *Son of God*; for there are *two Natures* in *one Person*, as I shall have occasion to prove afterwards.

From these Conclusions made good by Scriptures, *That God the Son is equal to God the Father*, and *That he equally with him claims all the Titles of a Supreme God*; I might very reasonably without any farther proof conclude, *That to him is also due the same religious Duties and supreme Worship as to God the Father.* But yet the better to stop the mouths of disobedient and gain-

gainfaying Hereticks, I shall go on to establish this last conclusion by Texts from God's Word, which is *the sword of the spirit*, Ephes. vi. 17. whereby we may be able to stand against the wiles of the Devil, Ibid. v. 11.

I shall begin with that very Text, by which the Captain of our Salvation (Hebr. ii. 10.) put to flight our Adversary, (1 Pet. v. 8.) the Devil, Matth. iv. 11.

Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve, Matth. iv. 10. quoted from Deut. vi. 13. and x. 20. only instead of *and thou shalt fear* is used *μαρτυροῖς*, which word is taken from Exod. xxxiv. 14. *thou shalt worship no other God*. Fear is part of God's Worship and Service, *serve the Lord with fear*, Psal. ii. 11. *in thy fear will I worship*, Psal. v. 7. Besides to the Text of Deuteronomy our Saviour has added *only*, to appropriate that *Worship* and *Service* to God, or Jehovah, for so it is in the Hebrew. Now this *Worship* and *Service* is paid to the Son of God by Angels themselves; for when he brings in the only begotten into the world, he saith, *And let all the Angels of God worship him*, Hebr. i. 6. [from Psal. xcvi. 7. where אלהים is by the LXX render'd ἄγγελοι] An Angel commands St. John to worship God, Apoc. xxii. 9. *The true Worshipers shall worship the Father*, — John iv. 23. Our Saviour receiv'd *Worship* from the wise Men,
Matth.

Matth. ii. 11. and from the Man who had been born blind, *John ix. 38.* after he had made Profession of his Belief in him, that he was the *Son of God*, ver. 35, 38.

Faith and Belief in [*eis into or in*] God is another religious Duty; and Christ himself, saith, *ye believe in God, believe also in me*, *John xiv. 1.* Read *Matth. xviii. 6.* and to them that believe on his Name, he gave Power to become the Sons of God, *John i. 12.* His Disciples believed on him after he had by a Miracle manifested his Glory, *John ii. 11.* whosoever believes in him, shall not perish, but have eternal life, *John iii. 15, 16, 36.* and vi. 29, 40. while ye have the light, believe in the light, *John xii. 36.* (and The Word is that light, *John i. 8, 9.* and xii. 45, 46.) Read *Acts xi. 17.* and xxii. 19. *1 Pet. ii. 6.*

Praise, and giving of Thanks are Duties paid only to God; to the Son as well as to the Father; as is plain from the Doxologies recorded in the Apocalypse, c. i. ver. 5. 6. *Unto him (Jesus Christ) be Glory and Dominion for ever and ever. Amen.* Thus St. Paul's Doxology to God the Father, *Unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be Honour and Glory for ever and ever. Amen.* *1 Tim. i. 17.* The name also of King is given to the Son, *Luke xix. 38.* and by the Prophet *Zachariah ix. 9.* *John xii. 15.* typified under

der Melchisedech, *King of Righteousness, King of Peace*, Hebr. vii. 2. And, as before, named by *Esaiah ix. 6. Prince of Peace*. And therefore Christ or Anointed. For which Reasons I am prone to think that this Doxology of St. Paul might have been intended even to God the Son, especially since in the same Chapter, ver. 12. the Apostle giveth Thanks to *our Lord Jesus Christ* for many Mercies received, ver. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16. And then his giving of Thanks is very fitly closed by this Divine Doxology to the same Lord Jesus Christ.

Again, we have heavenly Choirs, *ten thousand times ten thousands, and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice these Hymns or Doxologies*. Apoc. c. v. ver. 12, 13. *Worthy is the Lamb, that was slain, to receive Power, and Riches, and Wisdom, and Strength, and Honour, and Glory, and Blessing. And every Creature which is in Heaven, and on the Earth, and under the Earth, and such as are in the Sea, and all that are in them, heard I, saying: Blessing, Honour, Glory and Power be unto him, that sitteth on the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever*. Every Creature in Heaven spoke this to the Lamb: What? to their Fellow-creature? No. The *God and Father of Glory* (Acts vii. 2. Ephes. i. 17.) *whose Name is Jealous* (Exod. xxxiv. 14.) has declared by his Prophet, *Isai. xlii. 8.*

I am

*I am the Lord [Ihm Jehovah] that is my Name, and my Glory will I not give to another. And therefore God the Son is equally God with the Father, and has that same Name (as I proved before) and that same Glory. Hebr. xiii. 21. — through Jesus Christ, to whom be Glory for ever and ever. Amen. || 2 Pet. iii. 18. — in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to whom be Glory both now and for ever. Amen. Jud. ver. 25. To the only wise God our Saviour, be Glory and Majesty, Dominion and Power, now and ever. Amen. In which Text I may understand the Second Person of the Trinity by the word Saviour, for Jesus (which is one of the two names belonging to that Person) signifies Saviour, Matth. i. 21. And why may not we apply to him, 1 Tim. iv. 10. — we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, — and 1 Tim. i. 1. — by the Commandment of God our Saviour and Lord Jesus Christ — and Tit. i. 3. and ii. 10. Tho I know that the MS quoted by Dr. Hammond has in St. Jude, *μὲντοι θεῶ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κατεῖλε ἡμῶν δόξα, μεγαλοσύνη, καὶ ἄλκιμος, καὶ ἐξουσία πρὸς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν.* And besides, Tit. iii. 4. after that the Kindness and Love of God our Saviour towards men appear'd; not by works of Righteousness which we have done, but according to his Mercy be saved us by the washing of Regeneration,*

F and

and renewing of the Holy Ghost : ver. 6. which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour ——— there a distinct mention being made of the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity, how each of the Three was concerned in the great Work of our Salvation, the Title of *Saviour* is plainly given to the Father as well as the Son. Therefore since it is given equally to both, I may infer the *coequality* of Both; and where the name of a distinct Person is not joined to't, I may safely apply it to either. There are some Attributes of the Godhead which are more particularly given to one single Person, yet are common to another; as that of *Creator* to the Father, *Saviour* to the Son; notwithstanding the Son also is *Creator*, and the Father *Saviour*. So *Apoc. vii. 9.* an innumerable multitude stood before the Throne, and before the Lamb, crying out with a loud voice, ver. 10. *Salvation to our God, which sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb.*

This equal Communication of Attributes, which is admirably well expressed in the *Athanasian Creed*, shews the *Equality* of the Persons, in respect to the Unity of the Godhead. The Glory of God the Son is equal to and the same with the Glory of God the Father; *The Father is glorified in the Son, John xiv. 13.* and *the Son in the Father, John xiii. 32.* Let us therefore ho-
 now

nour the Son even as we honour the Father, John v. 23. Let us after the Example of the Church Triumphant in Heaven, the innumerable Company of Angels, the general Assembly, and Church of the First-born, and the Spirits of just men made perfect, (Hebr. xii. 22, 23.) ascribe Blessing, Honour, Glory, and Power, (Apoc. v. 13.) to God the Son as well as to God the Father. What hope can a Heretick ever have of being a Member of that glorious Company, when he most sacrilegiously divides the Substance and Godhead of those Divine Persons, whose one and the same Glory and Divinity those Heavenly Choirs with united Voice and joint Adoration for ever celebrate and worship?

Our *Arian* having made bold with *The Word*, which from everlasting was God, and with God, and, as it were, crucified afresh the eternal Son of the Father, affronting his Divinity, and (as much as in him lies) pulling him down from the Throne of his Glory to place him in the rank of those Creatures, those Servants, whose form he took on him to redeem them; offers violence to God's written Word; and denies the *Omniscience* of our Lord Jesus Christ, and his *Coequality* with the Father, by perverting the sense of the following Texts:

Matth. xxiv. 36. *But of that day and hour (i. e. of the last Judgment) knows no Man;*

no, not the Angels of Heaven, but my Father only, Mark xiii. 32 ——— no Man, not the Angels, ——— neither the Son, but the Father.

John xiv. 28. My Father is greater than I.

Matth. xix. 16. Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is, God.

1 Corinth. viii. 6. But to us there is but one God the Father.

And that this Blasphemer may leave no place of Scripture, (if there be any one more sacred than another) free from his pernicious perverse Exposition, he attempts the most Divine Prayer of our Saviour himself, in which (as I have hinted already) there are so many clear and indubitable Arguments for his eternal Divinity and perfect Unity with his Father, perverting this Text out of it, John xvii. 3. *This is Life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.*

Before I answer to the Inferences drawn from the wrong Application of these Texts, I shall premise this known, and by all Orthodox Christians acknowledged Article of Faith, That in the Second Person of the Holy Trinity Jesus Christ our Lord two distinct Natures are united, the Divine and the Human: Thus his Name was *Emmanuel, God with us*, Mat. i. 23. *Isai. vii. 14. There is one God, and one Mediator between God*

God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus, 1 Tim. ii. 5. Therefore in his Life written by the Evangelists he is sometimes called the Son of God, Mark i. 1. the Son of the living God, Matth. xvi. 16. truly the Son of God, Id. xiv. 33. and xxvii. 54. Sometimes the Son of Man, Id. viii. 20. the Son of David, Id. i. 1. As Son of Man he partaketh of all the Infirmities of Flesh and Blood (without Sin, 1 Pet. ii. 22.) and dies, Hebr. ii. 14, 17. and iv. 15. As Son of God, he riseth again, being the Resurrection and the Life, John xi. 25.

As Son of Man, he came eating and drinking, Matth. xi. 19. is three days and three nights in the heart of the Earth, Id. xii. 30. suffers, Id. xvii. 12. is betrayed into the hands of Men. Id. xvii. 22. is hungry, Matth. iv. 2. Mark xi. 12. thirsty, John xix. 28. weeps, Id. xi. 35. sleeps, Matth. viii. 24.

As Son of God, he fasteth forty days, and forty nights, Matth. iv. 1. healeth all manner of Sickness and Disease, Id. iv. 23. rebukes the Winds and the Sea, Id. viii. 26. restores sight to the Blind, feet to the Lame, ears to the Deaf, life to the Dead; cleanseth Lepers, Id. xi. 5. gives eyes to a Man born blind, John ix. 32. enters the doors being shut, Id. xx. 19.

As Son of Man he has no place where to lay his head, Matth. viii. 20. and is laid in a Manger, Luke ii. 7. As Son of God, Angels

gels sing a Hymn at his Birth, *Id.* ii. 13. and minister unto him, *Matth.* iv. 11.

“As Man, (saith St. Cyril, *Catech.* 4.) he
“eats as we do; as God, he feeds five thou-
“sands with five loaves; he dies, as Man,
“and raises him who had been dead four
“days, as God; he sleeps in the Ship, as
“Man; and walks on the Waters, as
“God.

These few Instances out of many may suffice at present. I shall observe farther, that the Propriety of one of these two Natures is sometimes communicated to the other; as, *no one has ascended into Heaven, but the Son of Man, which is in Heaven,* *John* iii. 13. *The Blood of his Son* (the Son of God) *cleanseth us from all Sin,* *1 John* i. 7. *The Blood of God,* *Acts* xx. 28.

Several seeming Contradictions are easily reconciled by considering the Person of Christ under these two Natures; for as *Son of Man*, it is not his to give and appoint places in Heaven, *Matth.* xx. 23. but as *Son of God*, even upon the Cross, he disposes of Paradise to the believing Thief, *Luke* xxiii. 43. he grants the Christian Conqueror to sit with him in his Throne, *Apoc.* iii. 21. As *Son of God*, he was before *Abraham*, *John* viii. 58. when, as *Son of Man*, he was not yet fifty years old, ver. 57.

The Communication of Attributes in these two distinct Natures infers not a Confusion of

of Substance, but proves the Unity of the Person of Christ; so I may say, that the Communication of Attributes (above-mentioned) in the two Persons of the Father and the Son infers not a Confusion of Persons, but proves the Unity of Substance.

But now to the understanding of those Texts perverted by this Heretick. The Son, as *Son of Man*, knew not the Day of Judgment; but, as *Son of God*, he is *Omniscient*, in him are hid all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge, Coloss. ii. 3. *As the Father knows him, so he knows the Father*, John x. 15. And can the Son, who knows the Father, and to whom the Father shews all things that he does, John v. 20. be any other but *Omniscient*?

If the Father is greater than the Son, it is as he is *Son of Man*: As he is *Son of God*, he thinks it not Robbery to be equal with God, Philip. ii. 5. If there be an inequality, there are two Gods, a greater and a lesser; but there is one God, Jam. ii. 19. *the Lord he is God, there is none else besides him*, Deut. iv. 35.

The Answer of our Saviour to the young Man, [*there is none good but one, that is, God,*] will be easily understood, as it is explained by St. Hierom. "He, who had called him good Master, and not confessed him God, or Son of God, learneth by this, that a Man, be he never so holy,
" yet

“ yet is not good, if compared to God ; of
 “ whom we read, Psal. cxviii. 1. O give
 “ thanks unto the Lord, for he is good. But
 “ let none imagine, that, because God is
 “ called good, therefore the Son of God is
 “ excluded from that goodness; since we
 “ also read, *I am the good Shepherd*; *The*
 “ *good Shepherd gives his Life for the Sheep*,
 “ John x. 11. Therefore our Saviour re-
 “ fuseth not the Testimony of his Good-
 “ ness, but shutteth out the mistake of the
 “ word *Master* without God. The same Ex-
 planation is given also by St. Chrysostom.
 Justin Martyr in his Second Apology has
 these words: “ Christ taught that God a-
 “ lone is to be worshipped, by this Text
 (out of partly *Matth. xxii. 38.* partly
 “ *Matth. iv. 10.*) *This is the greatest Com-*
 “ *mandment, thou shalt worship the Lord thy*
 “ *God, and him only shalt thou serve with*
 “ *all thy heart, and with all thy strength, &c.*
 “ And one coming to him and saying, *Good*
 “ *Master*, he answer’d, *there is none good,*
 “ *but God alone.* And in his Dialogue with
 Trypho the Jew; “ These words, (*Psal. xxii.*
 “ *4.*) *Our Fathers hoped in thee, and thou*
 “ *didst deliver them, &c.* shew that he owns
 “ those, who hoped in him and were saved
 “ by him, for Fathers; who were Fathers
 “ of the Virgin, of whom he was born and
 “ made Man: signifying also, that he should
 “ be preserved by God himself; but not glo-

“glorying to do any thing by his own
 “Counsel or Force. And he did the very
 “same thing [when he was] upon Earth:
 “and a certain Man saying, *Good Master,*
 “he answer'd, *why call'st thou me good?*
 “*one is good, my Father which is in Heaven.*
 [All the three Evangelists express the Text
 thus, *Matth. xix. 17. Mark x. 17. Luk. xviii.*
18. ὁ θεὸς ἀγαθὸς εἰμὲν ὁ θεός. But the Mar-
 tyr following the Sense sticks not to the
 Words, for before he has, *ὁ θεὸς ἀγαθὸς εἰμὲν*
μὲν ὁ θεός ὁ πῶτος πάντων and here, *εἰ*
ἐγὼ ἀγαθός, ὁ πᾶσις με ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.
 “And by that he saith (*Psal. xxii. 6.*) *I*
 “*am a Worm and no Man, a scorn of Men,*
 “*and contempt of the People,* he foretold
 “those things, which manifestly and truly
 “were done to him. From these two pla-
 ces of this Father thus word for word trans-
 lated I'll make this Inference: From the
 First, That he excludes no more our Lord
 from Goodness than from Worship, since
 he joins them together; and therefore he
 must mean, that those who look upon Christ
 only as mere Man, and not as God also, can
 neither worship him, nor look upon him, as
 the Master and only Fountain of all Good-
 ness. From the other place, 'tis plain, that
 he speaks in respect to our Saviour's Hu-
 man Nature, and to the lowest degree of
 his Humiliation; which is by the Figure
Meiosis expressed in these words, *I am a*
G Worm,

Worm, and no Man. Which positive Negation excludes not our Saviour from being *Man*; and by connexion, (for the Father joins the Texts) neither the numeral *εἰς* *one*, nor the exceptive Conjunction *ἐκ μὴ* *unless*, exclude our Saviour from being *Good*. Therefore as the Text before had a respect to our Lord's lowest abasement of himself for us, so the last must be referr'd to his Humanity; for Christ, as a Man, tho' he be *good*, yet he is not so *infinitely good*, the Fountain of all Goodness, as when he is considered as *God*.

The Text of *1 Cor. viii. 6.* has been largely discoursed on already. That of *John xvii. 3.* is understood the same way; for *the one God* or *the only God* attributed to God the *Father* can no more exclude the *Son*, than *one Lord* attributed to the *Son* can exclude the *Father*; or no more than the *Son* is excluded from being *Lord* by this Text, *Deut. vi. 4.* *The Lord our God is one Lord.* Thus *2 Sam. xxii. 32.* *Who is God save the Lord*: and in such like Passages, the Title *Lord*, which belongs to the Godhead, as the Title *God*, is given both to Father and Son equally.

I come in the last place to consider the Heretick's Objections from the *Nicene Creed*, and from a Collect of our Church: which need no other confutation than what has been already observed upon *1 Corinth. viii. 6.*

The

The *Nicene Creed*, in these words, *I believe in one God*, has not such a meaning, as the Heretick would maliciously force upon them; which is, that the Title *One God* should be restrained to the Father, exclusively from the Son. But it rather teaches us by the words *One God*, not only that God is but *One*; but also that this *One God* is *Three Persons*, *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*. So the sense is, *I believe in One God*, and *I believe in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Three Persons, yet but One God*. The very same may be applied to the *Apostle's Creed*, *I believe in God*.

The Objection from these words of the 18th Collect after *Trinity* (— to follow thee the only God, through *Jesus Christ* our Lord.) needs no other Answer, than what has been before proved, that the Titles *Only God* or *One God*, and *Only Lord* or *One Lord* exclude no more the Son from the one than the Father from the other. Which is evident from *St. Thomas's Confession* (quoted by *S. Cyprian. Testim. lib. 2. advers. c. 5. Jud. 6.*) *John xx. 28. My Lord and my God*, where our Saviour is acknowledged to be both Lord and God. Christ is both the Lord and the Lord's Christ, *Luk. ii. 11, 26.* *St. Cyprian* in that same place applies to Christ the following passage of Scripture among many others, *Esai. xlv. 14.* where we read, *surely God is in thee, and there is*

Cyp.

Esai.

Esai.

none else, there is no God — O God of Israel
the Saviour. From which Application I gather
that this holy Martyr and Ante-Nicene
Father believed the Son to be the one only
God as much as the Father.

I have finished my first Assertion against
the first Branch of this Heretick's Opinions,
in relation to the Son of God; having from
Scripture made out, That God the Son is e-
qual to God the Father.

I shall now in the next place, in op-
position to what he writes against the
Holy Ghost, lay down the following Pro-
position.

The Holy Ghost is God, equal to God
the Father and God the Son; and ought
equally to be the Object of our Adoration
and Prayers.

The Holy Ghost is call'd God.

Acts v. 3. Ananias is said to lie to the
Holy Ghost — and ver. 4. to have lied,
not unto Men, but unto God.

1 Corinth. iii. 16. Ye are the Temple of
God, and the Spirit of God dwells in you.
And xvi. ver. 19. Your Body is the Temple
of the Holy Ghost, and ver. 20. Glorify God
in your Body —

Ephes. iv. 30. Grieve not the Holy Spirit
of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the Day
of Redemption. And i. 13. Ye were sealed
with that Holy Spirit of Promise. And 2 Cor.
i. 22. — God, who bath also sealed us.

He

He has Titles, Attributes, and Operations ascribed to him equally with God the Father and God the Son; from which is drawn a Proof of the Coequality of his Godhead with the two other Persons.

He is the *eternal Spirit*, Hebr. ix. 14.

Creator; therefore in the Creation he moved upon the Waters, Gen. i. 2. and Psal. civ. 30. *Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, and they are created.*

Omniscient; for the Spirit searcheth all things, even the deep things of God, 1 Cor. ii. 10.

He no less than the Father and Son sends Apostles, Barnabas and Paul, Acts xiii. 1. and makes them Overseers over the Flock, xx. 28. St. Paul calls himself an Apostle of Jesus Christ, 1 Cor. i. 1. and not of Men, neither by Men, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father, Gal. i. 1.

He sanctifieth; — through Sanctification of the Spirit, 1 Pet. i. 2. as Christ also, Ephes. v. 25. and God the Father, Jud. ver. 1.

S. Hieron. *Hebid. Quast. 9.* “ The Holy Ghost is the Comforter or Paraclet; so also
 “ is Christ, as appears from John xiv. 16.
 “ The Father shall give you another Com-
 “ forter; so is the Father too, who is call’d
 “ 2 Cor. i. 3. the God of all Comfort. If
 “ the Father be Comforter, the Son Com-
 “ forter, the Holy Ghost Comforter, and
 “ the Believers are baptized in the Name of
 “ the

“ the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which
 “ Name is understood to be God : Then
 “ those Persons, which have but one Name
 “ of God and Comforter, have also but one
 “ Nature.

He ought to be revered and worshipped, because *he that blasphemeth against him, hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal Damnation*, Mark iii. 28, 29. *by his leading we are the Sons of God*, Rom. viii. 14. *by him we are adopted, and cry Abba Father*, ver. 15, 16. *he makes Intercession for us, and helps our Infirmities*, ver. 26. *regenerates and renews us*, Tit. iii. 5. *by him our mortal Spirits are quickned*, Rom. viii. 11. He hath his share in our Salvation, for our Lord *by him was conceived of the Virgin Mary*, Luke i. 35. *filled with him*, Id. iv. 1. *lighted on him at his Baptism*, Mat. iii. 16. *John Baptist came baptizing with Water, but our Saviour baptizeth with the Holy Ghost and with Fire*, Id. iii. 11. for in fiery Tongues *he descended on the Apostles*, Acts ii. 3. to inspire them, and lead them into all Truth, John xvi. 13. By him of old spoke the Prophets, Acts xxviii. 26. he is the Comforter, John xvi. 7. without him none can say that Jesus is the Lord, 1 Cor. xii. 3. for Faith is reckoned, Id. xii. 9. among those many spiritual Gifts and Operations which that one and self-same Spirit works, dividing to every Man severally, as he will, Ibid. v. 11. which

which Words, *as he will*, seem to signify, that tho' he proceeds from the Father and the Son, [*the Father will give you another Comforter*, John xiv. 16. *the Son sends the Comforter*, Id. xvi. 7.] yet he is not inferiour to either, but dispenseth his Gifts as he will. By him *we are all baptized into one Body* [the Church] 1 *Corinth.* xii. 13. and *he will abide with us for ever*, John xiv. 16.

No Creature can be capable of all those Divine high Operations, which the Holy Ghost performs; and therefore he is no *Creature*, but *God*, equal to the Father and the Son, since with the Father and the Son he equally partakes of the high Names and Attributes of the Divinity; and since he is *equally God*, he *equally* claims the same supreme Worship; and therefore, since Prayer is a part of Divine Worship, may and ought to be invoked. St. *Jude*, ver. 20. directs us *to pray in the Holy Ghost*: And we are bid to *ask, what we ask, in Christ's Name*, John xiv. 13. If therefore we pray *in Christ* and *to Christ*, why not *in the Holy Ghost* and *to the Holy Ghost*? *Faith* and *Prayer* are by our Lord, *Matth.* xxi. 22. joined together; nor may we put asunder, what God hath joined. Therefore since we *believe in*, we ought also to *pray to the Holy Ghost*.

Having from Scripture asserted the Coequality of the Three Persons, God the Father,

ther, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost; I pass in the third place, in opposition to what this *Arian* writes against the Trinity, to lay down this Proposition.

The Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity is to be acknowledged and worshipped.

Tho from the foregoing Premises this must needs naturally follow, yet, since the ground of our Faith is the Word of God, Rom. x. 17. and the better Foundation it hath in that Word, the more lasting and unshaken it will be, I'll produce several Texts in Scripture to bear witness to the Unity of the Three Divine Persons. And notwithstanding the malicious Industry of some Men, who chose rather to shake the great Foundation of Christianity, than not to shew what they have met with in their Travels abroad or at home; and the pert forwardness of those Criticks, who upon the private doubty Faith of one or two MSS pretend to juggle out the publick Authority and general Consent of the Church for many Ages: I will begin with the famous Text of 1 S. John v. 7.

There are Three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these Three are One. Which Text I believe to be genuine so much the more, because it has so natural a connexion with, and adds so great a confirmation to what

what went before concerning those Three Persons in relation to our Salvation; that is, our being *Children of God*, ver. 4. our *Faith in his Son*, ver. 5. and the joint *Witness* (*συμμαρτυρεῖ*, Rom. viii. 16.) of the *Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth*, ver. 6. with our Spirit, that we are *Sons of God*, and overcome the World; and since in the mouth of two (and much rather) *three Witnesses*, every word is established (2 Cor. xiii. 1.) Thus our Faith is attested in Heaven by a Divine Trinity; and these Three are One, ver. 7.

This Text besides has a necessary relation to what follows; for the Apostle, ver. 9. adds, that if we receive the *Witness of Men*, much more ought we to receive the *Witness of God* which is greater, and which he hath testified of his Son; and ver. 11. the *Witness is this*, that God has given us eternal Life, and this Life is in his Son. If God has given us eternal Life, and that Life is in his Son, then God owns us for his Children, and we are *born of God*, ver. 4. through Adoption, and by our *Faith in his Son* overcome the World; and through the *Spirit of Adoption* we call God, *Father*, [Rom. 8. 15.]. To this, *Three bear Witness on Earth, the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood*, which *Three agree in one* and the same Witness, ver. 8. And Three
H bear

bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these Three not only agree in one Witness, but are one, ver. 7. Thus this Text is the Center, as it were, and the main Spring, upon which the Apostle's Discourse both before and after chiefly turns. Thus the Center of our Faith, and the great Foundation of Christianity, is the Unity of the Godhead in a Trinity of Persons, which bear witness to this our Faith; and are one; and therefore our Faith is also said to be *one*. Which leads me to the next Proof of the Unity in Trinity out of *Ephes. iv. 4, 5*. Where the Apostle having exhorted the Christians to endeavour to keep *the Unity of the Spirit in the bond of Peace*, inforceth his Exhortation by reckoning up the several *Unities*, which Christians are bound to own by their Profession, *viz. one Body, one Spirit, one Hope of your Calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.*

Our Faith is one, because the Object of it is one; *i. e.* One God in Three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; which Three Persons, if any was greater or less than another, and therefore deserved a greater or less degree of Worship, could not be the Object of one and the same Faith, which is

part

part of our Christian Worship ; for then the greater must of consequence claim a greater, the less a less degree and proportion of Faith.

Our Baptism likewise is one, because the God, into whom we are baptized, is one ; and tho the Three Persons are recorded in that Form, which our Saviour himself instituted, (*Matth. xxviii. 19.*), yet (as *S. Hierom* observes) we are baptized into the *Name*, not the *Names* ; and that *one Name* is God, into which the Three Persons are united. Baptism is said (*1 Pet. iii. 21.*) to *save us*, for *he that believes, and is baptized, shall be saved*, *Mark xvi. 16.* and therefore the Name, into whose Faith we are baptized, is *one God*: *There is none other Name under Heaven given among Men whereby we must be saved*, *Acts iv. 12.* And in that place, ver. 10. That Name is affirmed to be the *Name of Jesus*, (*Rom. vi. 3. into Christ Jesus*) and *Acts viii. 16.* the new Believers were baptized into the *Name of the Lord Jesus*. Tho only the *Lord Jesus* is mentioned, yet no doubt must be made, but that the Apostles in obedience to Christ's Command used the Form of Baptism prescribed by him, and baptized the Christian Converts into the Father and the Holy Ghost as well as into the Son. Therefore the Name of the *Lord Jesus*, into which we are baptized, is no other than *God*, which is the

Name also of the Father and of the Holy Ghost; and that Name *God* is but *One*. Thus our Baptism as well as our Faith is but one. The Name then, into which we are baptized, must not be the Name of a Creature; not of any Angel, (for they are sent not to *save*, but to *minister to the Heirs of Salvation*, Hebr. i. 14,) not of an Apostle, (for *St. Paul*, 1 *Corinth.* i. 13. puts the Christians at *Corinth* in mind, that *they were not baptized into the Name of Paul*: Which putting them in mind of their Baptism, was the best way to heal their Divisions and Schisms, ver. 11. and bring them to *Unity of Spirit*, Ephes. iv. 4.) but of *One God*; and consequently the Son and Holy Ghost, into whom we are baptized, are no Creatures, but coequal to the Father; the Name of the Three Persons is *One God*.

The next Proof of Unity in Trinity shall be drawn from the Form of Blessing deliver'd by *St. Paul*, 2 *Cor.* xiii. 14. *The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all. Amen.* In which Form an express and distinct mention is made of three Persons, with three distinct Attributes. And every of the three Persons by himself must be *God*, and yet the three Persons but *one God*: for the Priests are order'd, Deut. xxi. 5. *to bless in the Name of the Lord* יהוה בשם which Name of *Jehovah* can be but *one*.

Some

Some Footsteps we have of the Plurality of the Persons, and the Unity of the Substance in the Godhead in Gen. i. 1. **בְּרָא אֱלֹהִים** God created. The word **אֱלֹהִים** God is plural according to the Idiom of that Sacred Language, and yet is here and every where else, when it signifies God, joined to a Verb singular, to shew that God is *one God*; yet *more*, than one Person. Otherwise this same word **אֱלֹהִים**, being not applied to God, is joined to plural Verbs, and then signifies Angels or Men in Authority; as Psal. xcvi. 7. *Let all the Angels* (**אֱלֹהִים** *ἄγγελοι*) *of God worship him*. Psal. lxxxii. 1. (where the word **אֱלֹהִים** is used also for God) *God stands* (**עָמַד אֱלֹהִים נֹצֵר** *ἵστησι θεὸς ὁμοιοῦς*) *in the Congregation of the Mighty* (**אֱלֹהִים**), *he is a Judge among Gods* (**אֱלֹהִים** *θεοὶ*) and ver. 6. *I have said, ye are Gods* (**אֱלֹהִים אַתֶּם**). Which Text our Saviour argues from, as *a minore ad majus*, against the unbelieving Jews, John x. 34, 35, 36. *If he called them Gods, unto whom the Word of God came — say ye of him whom the Father has sanctified, and sent into the World, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God.* From this we are to conclude that our Saviour is not one of those *created Gods*, but the *uncreated one*, the Son of God from all Eternity.

Again, Gen. i. 26. *God said* **וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים** *Let us make Man in our Image* — there

is a clear Plurality of Persons. Ver. 27. *God created* (וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים) *Man in his own Image.* There is as clear an Unity of the Godhead. The late Bishop of St. Asaph on the first Article quotes *Tertul. advers. Prax.* as using this place to prove the Trinity.

Lastly, in the Doxology of the Seraphim, *Isai.* vi. 3. and *Apoc.* iv. 8. we read; *Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of Hosts* (יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת)—or *Lord God Almighty* (ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ) where S. Hieron. & Andr. Casarius on the *Apocalyps*, by this treble repetition of *Holy*, understand the Mystery of Trinity in Unity. The same *Andreas Casarius* on *Apoc.* c.i. ver. 4. writes that these words,—*from him, which is, which was, and which is to come*, may be applied to One God in Three Persons; *which is*, to the Father, for he said to *Moses*, *I am that I am*; *which was*, to the Son, for in the Beginning was the Word; *which comes or is to come* (ἐρχόμενος), to the Holy Ghost, which came upon, and will still continue with the Church. To this Interpretation I'll add another of St. Hieron on the words of *Ephes.* iv. 5. applying, *which is above all* to the Father, *through all* to the Son, *in all* to the Holy Ghost; which Three are but One God.

Since the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost is one God, none may find fault with our
Doxo-

Doxology, *Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, (for Apocal. v. 13. δόξα τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ υἱῷ ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ καὶ τῷ ἀρνίῳ — Glory to him that sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb —) and to the Holy Ghost; for since Glory is due to the Name of God, Psal. xxviii. 2. and the Holy Ghost is God, Glory is also due unto him; and therefore (as we are taught in the Nicene Creed) he with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified.*

The Doctrine of Trinity in Unity and Unity in Trinity being grounded upon Holy Scripture, we may with a very safe Conscience comply with the *Athanasian Creed*, wherein that Doctrine is so plainly expressed and asserted to be *the Catholick Faith, which, whosoever will be saved, must keep whole and undefiled.*

I shall here insert, as a Summary and farther Illustration of my foregoing Assertions, the Observations and Arguments St. Chrysostom brings in his Homilies on that first Verse of the first Chapter of St. John's Gospel.

“ The other Evangelists began their Gospels from our Saviour's Humanity; Matthew from the Son of David and King Herod; Mark from our Lord's Kindred according to the Flesh, John and his Baptism; Luke from the Virgin Mary, and Tiberius Caesar. John beginning from his
“ eter-

“ eternal and divine Essence lifteth us to
 “ Heaven, carries our minds above all time,
 “ sets no bounds. *In the beginning was the*
 “ *word*, signifies his *Eternity*; and *The Word*
 “ *was in the beginning with God*, his *Coeter-*
 “ *nal*ity with his Father; so that neither
 “ Father nor Son is bounded. It may be
 “ objected, if he be a Son, how can it be
 “ but that he is less than the Father; for
 “ what is from another, is after that, from
 “ which it is. We answer that we now
 “ are talking of God, not of humane Na-
 “ ture, which is subject to the consequence
 “ and necessity of our Reasonings. But for
 “ the sake of weak Capacities we will bring
 “ some Example. The Light of the Sun
 “ flows from the Nature of the very Sun;
 “ and yet its Rays and Light are not poste-
 “ rior to it, for it never riseth, and ap-
 “ pears without them. If we find that, even
 “ in Bodies perceptible by sight and sense,
 “ what proceeds from another, is not al-
 “ ways posterior to that, whence it pro-
 “ ceeds; why should not we believe the
 “ same of an invisible ineffable Nature? If
 “ the Father be before the Son, there must
 “ be a measure and space of Time between
 “ the Father and the Son. No measure can
 “ be, without a beginning on either side;
 “ and the Father himself will be compre-
 “ hended under a beginning. But the word,
 “ *was*, can’t be measured, but signifies *Eter-*
 nity,

nity. The words *is* and *was* applied to
 Men, signify a Time finite, present or
 past; but applied to God, they denote
 Eternity. We read in *Mal. xlii. 10.* *I*
am he before me there was no God for-
me, neither shall there be [any] after
me. How then can God the Son be po-
 sterior to God the Father? What is infi-
 nite, has neither beginning nor ending,
 as is declared, *Hebr. vii. 3.* *He who is*
Life it self, is without beginning and
without ending. But then, some may
 reply, if he has no beginning, why is it
 written, that *the Word was in the begin-*
ning? I answer that this sets bounds to
 the Son, no more, than are set to the Fa-
 ther by these words, *Psal. xc. 2.* *From*
Age to Age (am & aion & ias & aion)
thou art God. [Therefore *ayon* is
 translated in English *everlasting*] A Term
 is fixed here no more than there: nor
 can it be with any reason inferred, that
 because the Son was *in the beginning*, there-
 fore he had a beginning.

But how dares any Man; whose *breath is*
in his Nostrils, whose *days are as it were a*
span long, whose *Life is vanity*, who *walks*
in a vain shadow, who knoweth neither his
end nor the number of his own days; how
 can that Creature, whose *days are nothing*
in respect of his Maker, that pitiful *Worm*,
 presume to fathom the bottomless depth of

Eternity, find out a time, before time was; and pretend to inform himself, when his Maker was not; intrude himself (with a diabolical Pride) between God the Father, who made him, and God the Son, who redeem'd him; divide the Deity, and separate the one Substance of the Godhead. It behoves us much better to follow the Advice of *Ruffinus* in his Exposition of the Creed: "Examine not in what manner God the Father begot the Son, nor pry too curiously into the Mystery of this depth; lest, while thou too obstinately searchest into the brightness of inaccessible Light, thou lose that small Light, which God has granted to us Mortals."

What can we imagine can outdate Time and the Creation of the World, and of all things visible and invisible, but that unsearchable Abyfs of Eternity, which God and The Word, which was with him, does inhabit? 'Tis infinitely less impossible to span the whole Globe of the Creation, than to comprehend or set bounds to the Eternity of the Creator. And therefore the Paraphrast *Nonnus* expresses it thus:

"Αχρονῶ ὡς, ἀκίνητος, ἐν ἀρρήτῳ λόγῳ ἀρχῇ,
 Ἰσοφυὲς γρηπῆρος ὁμήλικῶ, ὑὸς ἀμήταρ,
 Καὶ λόγῳ ὑποφυταῖο θεῷ, φῶς ἐκ φάεῶ φῶς,
 Παῖρὸς ἔλω ἀμείλιχῶ, ἀτέρμονι σύνθερονῶ ἑδρη,
 Καὶ θεὸς ὑψιγρηθλῶ ἔλω λόγος. —

" The

in 51 (ypm)
 an. 2. p.
 158. 8d.
 Augd. Anno
 1537.

“ The Word was without Time, incom-
 “ prehensible, in the beginning not to be ex-
 “ pressed, equally existing with his coeter-
 “ nal Father, Son without a Mother, the
 “ Word of the self-existing God, Light,
 “ Light of Light, inseparable from his Fa-
 “ ther, sitting together with him on his
 “ eternal Throne; and That High-begotten
 “ Word was God.

But that this Heretick may not here ob-
 ject (as he does p. 112. against our Doxo-
 logies *One God, whom we adore*) that what
 the Poet *Nonnus* writeth, is only to make
 up his Verse; I will here bring the uncon-
 testable Testimony of an *Ante-Nicene* Fa-
 ther, *Justin Martyr*, who writes thus of
 God the Son. ^a Αὐτὸς ἕως μόνου καὶ ἀγγελου
 καλέμενον καὶ θεὸς ὑπαρχόν. “ He himself
 “ only is said to be the Angel, and to be
 “ God. And besides it is plain that the
 Holy Father calls the Son here not only
 μόνου θεός *The only God*, but also αὐτὸς θεός
The very God; for he saith in another ^b place,
 ἡ αὐτὸς ἀντωνυμία τὸ ὄντως ὄντα σημαίνει θεόν.
 This Pronoun *Self* signifies *The very God*.
 Since therefore the Son, as well as the Fa-
 ther, is by *Justin Martyr* call'd *The only*
God and *The very God*, we must conclude
 that he believed the Father and the Son to

^a P. 74. Ex edit. R. Stephani.

^b P. 22. These two Places are quoted by *Aretius* in his
 History of *Gentilis*.

be the same one God. Again in his Exposition of the Faith ^e he affirms that *the one God is made known in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and that these three Persons partake of one Essence, and have but one Divinity. And ^d 'tis fit to own one God manifested in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost — The Unity is understood in the Trinity, and the Trinity known in the Unity. So p. 177.* ^e And in the 139th Answer to the Quest. ad Orthod. *There is one God in the Co-existence of three Divine Persons differing not in their Essence, but in their manner of Existence.*

This last Citation is out of a Work not of this, but of some other Justin, because in Resp. 82. mention is made of Origen, who was born An. 185. Justin Martyr suffer'd An. 161. I could however bring several other Testimonies out of Justin Martyr's Exposition of Faith; but I'll leave the Task of examining the Fathers thoroughly to some abler hand.

I have now finished, what I had to alledge from Scripture concerning the Three Divine Persons and the Trinity; and shall go on to maintain against this Man's Heresy about the Incarnation the following Proposition.

^e P. 172.

^d P. 176.

^e P. 295. These three Passages are cited by the late Bishop of St. Asaph on the first Article.

Our Lord's Human Nature consisted of an Human rational Soul as well as an Human Body : and the rational Soul of his Human Nature was not supplied by the λόγος or Divine Nature.

Hebr. ii. 17. *In all things it behoved him to be made like unto his Brethren.* And how can our Lord be like unto us in all things, if his Human Nature has not, as ours, an Human rational Soul. 1 John 5, 20. *We are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal Life.* The word *True* in the first Sentence must refer to Christ ; if as he is God, I shall make use of the Text to prove against him, what he denied before, that our Lord is call'd in Scripture *the true God* ; (besides that in the second Sentence the word *This*, may by Grammatical Reference, relate to the word before *Christ*, and join to it *the true God*.) if as he is *Man*, how can he be *true Man*, if he wants the rational Soul of a Man?

1 Tim. ii. 5. *There is one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus.* Gal. iii. 20. *A Mediator is not of one, but God is one.* Since a Mediator ought to partake equally of what belongs to those, between whom he mediates, how could our Saviour be Mediator between God and Man, if he had not an equal share of the whole

Na-

Nature of the one, as he had of the whole Nature of the other.

Since God in his incomprehensible and unquestionable Wisdom found this Expedient to recover lost Mankind, that the Nature, in which the Offence had been committed, should be assumed into the Godhead of the Second Person of the Trinity; we may humbly infer, that the Offender is delivered through that Assumption from the eternal Punishment due to him; and therefore nothing has a right to that deliverance, but what was assumed: and therefore the fallen Angels are excluded from the Salvation common (*Jude ver. 3.*) to us Men, and proper to our Nature; because Christ took not their Nature, *Heb. ii. 16.* Now the rational Human Soul had a much greater share in the Offence than the Human Body; and the rational Souls were to share no less in the Redemption (*1 Pet. i. 9. receiving the end of your Faith, even the Salvation of your Souls.* And *1 Thess. v. 23. — your whole Spirit, and Soul and Body may be presented blameless —*) Therefore, according to the revealed Method of the Divine Dispensation, we must believe, that our Lord took upon him not only a Body, but also an *Human rational Soul*; else we are redeemed but by half; but our Saviour is *perfect*, *Heb. v. 9.* and his Salvation is *perfect*, to the utmost, *Heb. 7. 25.*

Again,

Again, our Saviour was subject to the Affections and Passions of an Human Rational Soul, and therefore had such a one.

Heb. iv. 15. Our High Priest can be touch'd (συμπαθεῖν to suffer with) with the feeling of our Infirmities; he was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without Sin.

John xi. 33. When Jesus saw Mary and the Jews weeping, he groaned in the Spirit and was troubled ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι, καὶ ἐτάραξαν ἑαυτὸν) and ver. 35. wept, *Mark viii. 12.* He sighed deeply in his Spirit. *Mark xiv. 34.* *John xiii. 21.* and *Matth. xxvi. 28.* When he was come to Gethsemane, he was sore amazed and very heavy (ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν) his Soul was exceeding sorrowful (ψυχὴ πένιπτος) unto Death; and he prayed, that if it were possible, the hour might pass from him. *Luke xxii. 43, 44.* when he was in such an Agony, that his Sweat was as it were great Drops of Blood falling down to the Ground, there appeared an Angel to him from Heaven strengthening him. *Hebr. v. 7.* In the days of his Flesh he offer'd Prayers and Supplications, with strong crying and Tears, unto him that was able to save him from Death, and was heard in that he fear'd. *Matth. xxvii. 46.* On the Cross he cried with a loud Voice, my God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? *Luke xxiii. 46.* and said, Father, into thy Hands I commend my Spirit. *Esai. liii. 10.* His Soul was made an Offering.

for

for Sin. The Hebrew Word חטא is very emphatical, for in its proper Signification it signifies Sin, Guilt; *Levit. iv. 3. Gen. xxv. 10.* but by a Metonymy a *Trespass-Offering*, *1 Sam. 6. 3.* That Word in the forecited Place of *Isaiah* is very significantly expressed by St. Paul, *2 Cor. v. 21. He has made him to be Sin for us, who knew no Sin.*

In the foregoing Texts is used sometimes the Word πνεῦμα, the Spirit, sometimes ψυχή, the Soul; to cut off all Evasion from our Heretick, who [p. 5.] distinguisheth ψυχή the sensitive Soul from πνεῦμα the rational Soul or Spirit, that thereby he might reconcile, to his Notion, the Testimony of *Justin Martyr*, whom he [p. 3.] found expressly asserting, that the entire Person of Christ included a ψυχή as well as the λόγος and a σῶμα, a Soul as well as the Divine Nature and a Body.

Before I proceed to make my Application of the foregoing Texts, I shall shew, that this very Assertion, which he brings out of *Justin Martyr*, is directly contrary to his Opinion. The Assertion is, that the entire Person of Christ, includes a Divine Nature λόγος, a Soul, and a Body. And then he infers, that, since *Man* (according to what he brings from the same Father *de Resurr. Dr. Grabe's Spirit. 9.*) does include just the same Number of Parts a πνεῦμα or rational Soul, a ψυχή or sensitive Soul, a σῶμα Body,

dy, then by consequence, the λόγος or *Divine Nature* in Christ supplied the Place of the πνεῦμα or *Rational Soul* in Man. Can a Man, that knows any thing of *Logick*, one of the *Arts* he calls himself *Master* of, or of *Mathematicks*, whereof he has been *Professor*, argue at this rate? Must the *entire Person* of Christ, or his *two Natures* (for his *Person* consists of both) include just the same number of *Parts*, as *Man*, which is but *one Nature*? Must the *two Natures* include no more than *one*, because the *Person*, wherein they are united, is but *one*? But 'tis plain, that the Assertion, he quotes from the *Martyr*, intimates the *entire Person* of Christ to be consisting of *two Natures*, the *Divine* or the λόγος, the *Human* or the ψυχή and σῶμα. Else, if according to this Man's Explanation the λόγος, (which, as he would have it, supplied the Place of the πνεῦμα) the ψυχή and σῶμα be the *Parts* of Christ's *Human Nature*, then the *entire Person* of Christ shall include but *one Human Nature*. If Man's Nature includes these three *Parts*, must those three *Parts* be the same as those which are included in the *entire Person* of Christ? Why must the λόγος supply the πνεῦμα? Then either the *Divine Nature* is excluded from the *entire Person* of Christ; or else the λόγος must be taken in *two Senses*, both as the *Divine Nature*, and as the πνεῦμα or *Rational Soul* of the *Human*. But if it be necessary

cessary that one of the Words must bear two Senses, lest the *rational* Soul should seem to be left out, why may not $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ be allowed as well as, nay much rather than, $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron$, to signify here two things? my reasons for it are these.

I. 'Tis more likely that the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ should bear two Significations in one human Nature, the $\tau\acute{o}$ λογιστικόν and the $\tau\acute{o}$ αἰσθητικόν (as Aristotle understands it) than that the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron$ should bear them in two distinct Natures, the Divinity in the Divine, the Rationality in the Human.

II. In Holy Writ, $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron$ the *Word which was God, and with God*, is never taken for the rational Soul of a Man; but $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ $\psi\epsilon\lambda$ the Soul is used not only for the sensitive Faculty; as Lev. xvii. 11. *The Life $\psi\epsilon\lambda$ $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ of all Flesh is in the Blood.* The LXX. render it, αἷμα ἔστι is the Blood. But also for the rational; as Gen. ii. 7. *man became a living Soul $\psi\epsilon\lambda$ $\tau\acute{o}$ $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ LXX. $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ $\zeta\omega\sigma\alpha\nu$ Targum אכלת חיה a speaking or rational Spirit. So here $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ signifies $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ λογικόν. Act. iv. 2. *The Believers were of one Heart and one Soul $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ μία.* Eph. vi. 6. *doing the Will of God $\epsilon\kappa$ $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\varsigma$ from the Heart*, in both which $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ must signify the rational Part.*

III. The Soul, $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ may much more properly include the *rational* and *sensitive* $\tau\acute{o}$ λογιστικόν $\tau\acute{o}$ αἰσθητικόν, as the Genus does its Species; than

than the λογος the *Word* or *Divinity* include itself and the *rational Soul of the Humanity*: for how can we suppose these to be included? not certainly as the *Species* under their *Genus*; since, if so, one of the *Species* will be both *Species* and *Genus* to itself.

The Absurdities of this position will farther appear by what follows.

I shall now resume the Application of the Texts a little before cited, *He was troubled in Spirit*, thinking of the Traitor *Judas*, where the *Word Soul* relates not to the sensitive αἰσθητικὴ ψυχὴ but to the rational or λογικὴ. And besides if in those very Places, it should be allow'd that it means the sensitive Part, it may follow, that the λογος, which he saith supplied the rational one, being as strictly united to that sensitive Part, as our *Soul* is to the *Body*, did partake of the *Passions* of that sensitive Part, as our *Souls* have a Perception of the *Passions* of our *Bodies*. But can the λογος, the *Word* which was *God*; can the *Divinity* be troubled, fore amazed, be exceeding sorrowful even unto *Death*, want an *Angel's Help*, desire to be saved from that hour, unto which he, for this cause, came, (*John xii.27?*) Can the *Divinity* weep and pray, for these are the *Acts* of a rational *Soul*? Can *God* be made *Sin*? Can He have a feeling of human *Infirmities*, and in all *Points* be tempted like a *Man*? Can *Omnipotence* feel.

Weakness? Can God upon a Cross (for the rational Soul, while in the Body, must sympathize with it) complain of being forsaken? By whom? By himself? Into whose Hands can he recommend himself? *Justin Martyr* in his Dialogue with *Trypho* writes, that our Saviour commended his Spirit πνεῦμα into the Hands of his Father to preserve it safe: If there the λόγος or Divinity be that πνεῦμα, was our Lord afraid his Divinity might any way suffer? but since that holy Writer teaches us, from Christ's Example, that we, at our departure out of this Life, ought also to commend our Souls to God, that they may not fall into any Danger, it is plain that by πνεῦμα Spirit he understands the Soul, not the *sensitive*, for Sense ceases at the Separation of Soul and Body, but the *rational human Soul*; certainly not the λόγος or Divinity, which in the beginning was with God, and not subject to any Danger whatsoever.

Our Saviour saith, (*John* x. 15, 17, 18.) that he lays down his Life (or Soul ψυχῇ) for his Sheep, that he lays it down, that he might take it again: And it is written that he, at his Death, gave up the Ghost (πνεῦμα). Is not therefore (τιθέναι ψυχῇ) to lay the Soul down the same as (ἀφίεναι πνεῦμα) to give up the Ghost? And if ψυχὴ means πνεῦμα, and the πνεῦμα be the λόγος, did our Saviour lay down his Divinity, and take

take it up again? If the λόγος be the *rational Soul* of the *Human Nature*, then the *Divine Nature* (which has no parts itself, for God is without Parts) is *Part* of, and less than the *Human*; and since the *Divine Nature* is as much bigger and nobler than the *Human*, as *Infinite* is bigger than *Finite*, *Omnipotence* than *Weakness*, *Omnipresence* than *Place*, *Omniscience* than *bounded Knowledge*; and yet the *Part* is lesser than the whole: Then the *Divine Nature* shall be both *bigger* and *lesser* than the *Human*. What monstrous Contradiction! neither let the Contradiction be solved, by saying that it is a *Mystery*. *Mysteries* are above, but not against our Reason. As in the *Mystery* of the *Trinity*, tho' the *Union* of the three Persons in one God is beyond *Comprehension*, yet there is no *Contradiction*, for *three* and *one* are not affirmed of the *same*; *three* is affirmed of the *Personality*, *one* of the *Godhead*: but the *Union* between the *Personality* and the *Godhead* is beyond any finite *Understanding*. So in the *Incarnation*, the Word ἐγένετο σὰρξ, God the Son assumes *Human Nature*, for the Word בשר σὰρξ is by *Synecdoche* in the *Scripture* taken for the whole *Man*, as *Deut.* v. 26, 24. *Pf.* lxxv. 2. *John* xvii. 2. *Matth.* xxiv. 22. [Read *S. Aug. lib. de Quæst. Octog. Q. 80.*] tom. 4.
p. 603.
604. This *Mystery* is liable to no *Contradiction*; our *Saviour* may be *lesser than*, and *equal* where to the *Father*; *Omniscient* and yet *ignorant* of consubst. yⁱ Apollinarians.

Weakness? Can God upon a Cross (for the rational Soul, while in the Body, must sympathize with it) complain of being forsaken? By whom? By himself? Into whose Hands can he recommend himself? *Justin Martyr* in his Dialogue with *Trypho* writes, that our Saviour commended his Spirit πνεῦμα into the Hands of his Father to preserve it safe; If there the λόγος or Divinity be that πνεῦμα, was our Lord afraid his Divinity might any way suffer? but since that holy Writer teaches us, from Christ's Example, that we, at our departure out of this Life, ought also to commend our Souls to God, that they may not fall into any Danger, it is plain that by πνεῦμα Spirit he understands the Soul, not the *sensitive*, for Sense ceases at the Separation of Soul and Body, but the *rational human Soul*; certainly not the λόγος or Divinity, which in the beginning was with God, and not subject to any Danger whatsoever.

Our Saviour saith, (*John* x. 15, 17, 18.) that he lays down his Life (or Soul ψυχῇ) for his Sheep, that he lays it down, that he might take it again: And it is written that he, at his Death, gave up the Ghost (πνεῦμα). Is not therefore (τιθέναι ψυχῇ) to lay the Soul down the same as (ἀφίεναι πνεῦμα) to give up the Ghost? And if ψυχῇ means πνεῦμα, and the πνεῦμα be the λόγος, did our Saviour lay down his Divinity, and take

take it up again? If the *λογος* be the *rational Soul* of the *Human Nature*, then the *Divine Nature* (which has no parts itself, for God is without Parts) is *Part* of, and less than the *Human*; and since the *Divine Nature* is as much bigger and nobler than the *Human*, as *Infinite* is bigger than *Finite*, *Omnipotence* than *Weakness*, *Omnipresence* than *Place*, *Omniscience* than *bounded Knowledge*; and yet the *Part* is lesser than the whole: Then the *Divine Nature* shall be both bigger and lesser than the *Human*. What monstrous Contradiction! neither let the Contradiction be solved, by saying that it is a *Mystery*. *Mysteries* are above, but not against our Reason. As in the *Mystery* of the *Trinity*, tho' the *Union* of the three Persons in one God is beyond *Comprehension*, yet there is no *Contradiction*, for *three* and *one* are not affirmed of the same; *three* is affirmed of the *Personality*, *one* of the *Godhead*: but the *Union* between the *Personality* and the *Godhead* is beyond any finite *Understanding*. So in the *Incarnation*, the Word *ἐξ ἑνὸς ὁσῶς*, God the Son assumes *Human Nature*, for the Word *ὁσῶς* is by *Synecdoche* in the *Scripture* taken for the whole *Man*, as *Deut.* v. 26, 24. *Pf.* lxxv. 2. *John* xvii. 2. *Matth.* xxiv. 22. [Read *S. Aug. lib. de Quest. Octog. Q. 80.*]

This *Mystery* is liable to no *Contradiction*; our *Saviour* may be *lesser than*, and *equal* to the *Father*; *Omniscient* and yet *ignorant* *of* *confusions*.

4ⁱ Apollinarius.

of the day of Judgment, because these contrary Propositions are not affirmed of the same Subject, but of two distinct Natures, each of which preserves it's own incommunicable Proprieties; the Divine communicates not its Omniscience to the Human, nor the Human its Minority to the Divine; neither excludes the other; if the Human was Omniscient, it would not be Human. Our Lord, Our Emanuel, as he is God, is not less than God, for being Man; as he is Man, he is not more than Man, for being God. And as *Justin Mart.* has it in his Exposition of the Faith; " He is understood to be God
 .. " by the working of Miracles, and shewn
 " to be Man (*ὁμοιοπαθεῖν τὴ φύσιν*) by suffering like things with our Nature. It appears that the Soul (*συμπίχει*) sympathiseth, which none in his Senses can dare to say of or admit in the Divinity of Christ. By this we see that the Martyr did not believe the λόγος the Divinity to supply the Part of the Human Rational Soul. *S. Hieron Hedib. Quæst. 9.* " One and the same is Son of God, and Son of Man; and whatever he speaks, we refer, partly to his Divine Glory, partly to our own Salvation. Our Heretick either makes our Lord's Human Nature less than Human
 .. " by denying it its Human rational Soul, or raises it above Human by supplying its want by the Divinity; which Absurdities and Contradi-

traditions he thinks to avoid by affirming also our Lord, as he is *God*, to be *less* than the Father, and not as *omniscient* as he, and so makes the *Divine Nature less than Divine*. If we examine his Opinion nearer, we can't but startle at it. He [p. 5.] writes, that *Man contains more Parts than the Brutes, and has besides its gross Body, and its ψυχὴ or sensitive Soul, a πνεῦμα or rational Soul*. And [p. 6.] that the *Λόγος* in Christ supplied the place of the πνεῦμα or rational Soul in Man, without any other rational Soul at all. If the Body and sensitive Soul are all that the Brutes have, and the Human Nature of Christ of it self has no more, what can follow but that his Human Nature, were it not supplied by the Divine, is no better than that of Brutes, much worse than that of Men. Blasphemous Man! Was not it enough for the eternal Son of God to leave the Throne of his Glory, and be made a little lower than the Angels, Hebr. ii. 9. to empty himself (ἐκένωσεν) take on him the form of a Servant, Phil. ii. 7. to suffer, and be tempted in all things like as we are (Hebr. iv. 15. and ii. 17, 18.)? Is not it Condescension enough for God to be born Man? Must he be less Man than we, have our Body and Sense, but not our Reason? Must he be degraded into a Nature inferiour to ours? To strip his Human Nature of its Human Reason is more than to crucify him.

p. 69. " say (writes St. *Augustin* in the place fore-
 cited) " that he had not a rational Soul,
 " whereby a Man differs from Brutes, is to
 " believe that the only begotten Son of God,
 " the Father's Wisdom and Word, by whom
 " all things were made, took upon him
 " (*belluam quandam*) a certain Brute with
 " the Figure of an Human Body. What
 monstrous Consequences does Heresy seduce
 us into! Let us therefore hold fast the Pro-
 fession of our Faith; that our Lord is *per-*
fect God and perfect Man; equal to the Fa-
ther, as touching his Godhead; inferiour to
the Father, as touching his Manhood. He
 was subject to all, except the sinful Infir-
 mities of Human Nature, *Hebr. iv. 15.* As
 Man, he acts as a Man: As God, he acts as
 God. As Man, he is ignorant of some things,
 as of the Day of Judgment: As God, he has
 in himself all the Treasures of Knowledge.
 'Tis not (as I observed before) contradiction
 to affirm that Christ knows, and is ignorant
 of, the Day of Judgment; because he has
 two distinct Natures, of which these diffe-
 rent things are spoken. Let not the Hereti-
 cal Sceptick object with the little Reason he
 has, (tho he pretends to ne'er so much) that
 Christ could not be ignorant of what his
 Divinity (if it knew) might communicate
 to him. This little and many more such
 like forlorn Arguments are sufficiently an-
 swer'd thus, that such a Communication as
 he

he means here, would destroy the distinction of the Natures ; if one Nature shared what only belongs to the other : the same thing would be *proper to one*, and *common to both*. Thus these great Pretenders to Reason, while they refuse to submit their Faith to Religion under the pretence of avoiding Contradictions, run themselves upon them unavoidably. In a Man the Soul and the Body are united, and have each of them some *proper* Qualities, which belong not to t'other. In the second Person of the blessed Trinity the Divine and Human Natures are united, and each of them keeps to it self its own Properties, which still are *proper* to each *Nature*, but *common* to the one Person, in whom those Natures are joined ; for *as the reasonable Soul and Flesh is one Man, so God and Man is one Christ*. In the different Operations of two thus different Natures there is nothing to contradict or offend our Reason, since those *different* Operations are not attributed to *one and the same* Nature. But the Union of those *two different* Natures into *one* Person, as well as the Union of *Three* Persons in *one* Divine Nature, are Mysteries above the shallow finite Reason of Man, who is not able to understand perfectly the Union between his own Soul and Body, much less that, which is more to be adored than pried into. *O the depth of the Riches both of the Wisdom and Knowledge of*

L

God!

God! How unsearchable are his Judgments and his Ways past finding out! Rom. xi. 33. He does things, which we cannot comprehend, Job xxxvii. 3. Who is he, that darkeneth Counsel by words without knowledge? Job xxxviii. 2. that contends with the Almighty, Job xl. 2. and aims to utter things too wonderful for him, which he knows not? Job xlii. 3.

Having overthrown by Scripture the Heretodox Opinions of this *Arian* Heretick, I shall in the last place invalidate and null the Authority of those Books, which he has the confidence to obtrude upon us, as in Authority equal to some, and even superiour to others of the Canonical Scriptures owned by the Catholick Church. My Argument against them shall be briefly this.

God's Word can't contradict it self, by destroying in one place, what it establisheth in another. Our Canonical Scriptures (as has before been shewed) are so far from favouring, that they plainly condemn the *Arian* Opinions. Those Books, which are by this Man imposed on us, have (by his own confession) several Passages favourable to the *Arian* Opinion. Thus there is an absolute contradiction between the Scriptures already received, and his pretended new ones; and both together can't be the true Word of God. Since therefore the first is by all and by him also owned to be such, there

there is an invincible Impossibility, that the last should be so too.

I have now as briefly as I could summed up, what Reply I had to make out of Holy Writ against this Man's dangerous Opinions; and because in the beginning of this Discourse I touched upon *Valentinus Gentilis*, I will now (as a thing very pertinent to my present purpose) present the Reader with a parallel between him and this *Gentilis*, whose short History was published in Latin by *Bened. Aretius* 1567. and translated into English 1696. to which last Edition I shall refer my Quotations on the one side, and to our Heretick's Historical Preface on the other.

Gentilis.

Whiston.

PAG. 17. When *Gentilis* arrived at *Geneva*, there were several *ἡρώων δογματῶν ἀρεταί* Inventors of new Doctrines: such were *Blandrata*, *Gribaldus*, and this *Gentilis*, who boldly asserted, that the Reformed Churches were still agreed with the Papists in that abo-

PAG. 85. a few of the Discoveries in my Papers are contrary to the receiv'd Notions, Doctrines, and Practices of almost all Christian Churches.

P. 27. That Creed [of *Athanasius*] is most evidently a gross Corruption, composed under and establish'd by

minable and grievous the Antichristian Error of subscribing Church, [meaning to the Article of the the Popish.] Trinity.

Gentilis.

Whiston.

P. 20. He made some miserable, imperfect, broken Quotations out of *Ignatius's* Epistles, *Justin Martyr*, &c. And then he very roundly condemn'd all the rest of the Fathers, such as *St. Austin*, *St. Jerom*, *St. Basil*, &c. and whoever else had plainly expressed their Thoughts concerning the Trinity in a different way from him.

P. 4, 5, 6. I read over all the known Catholick Books and Fragments, till near the conclusion of the second Century, &c. a noble Fragment of *Justin*, *Ignatius's* larger Epistles, &c. P. 15, 16. I observed in my Enquiry, that the Opinions of the two and almost three first Centuries were very different from those of the fourth, and following ones.

whose late Authorities can't excuse me from embracing the Original Faith, receiv'd in the first Ages of the Gospel.

P. 22. He added many scurrilous Reflections upon *St. Athanasius*;

P. 98, to p. 109. *Athanasius* was a violent Party-man, the Author of a new Sect in the Church; resolute, ambitious, tyrannical; of little Learning, and small appearance of Sincerity; un-

unwilling to submit either to Emperor and Council ; who would rather set the Christian World in a Combustion, than recede from his Pretensions ; not sufficiently cleared from the Murther of *Arsenius* the *Meletian* Bishop ; Forger of false Miracles ; citing *Ignatius's* spurious Copies for genuine ; guilty of Knavery, and Infidelity, the Fore-runner of Antichrist.

Gentilis.

Whiston.

P. 23. He abused the Name and Authority of the Governor of *Gaium*, by dedicating his Book to him, which so highly incensed him, that could he have laid hold of him, he would immediately have thrown him into Goal again.

So does he in dedicating his blasphemous Preface to the most Reverend the President, and all the Members of the Convocation. In which Preface he has the confidence to publish (without leave) the private Letters of both Archbishops, Bishop of *Worcester*, &c. abu-

sing many reverend and worthy Names, and, among the rest, the Memory of the learned Bishop *Bull*, whom p. 67. he accuses of having too often perverted God's Truth, and the Testimonies in Antiquity belonging to them. He makes mention of Dr. *Hicks*, (p. 44.) who has given me leave to assure the Reader that he is very far from thinking his

his Answer in the least satisfactory to that Prelate's learned Epistle. He writes, *Append.* p. 22. that Dr. *Smalridge* read his Papers, and that he believes he had a very good Opinion of them. I'll leave the Doctor and several others to do themselves right. This Man must have bidden farewell to all Modesty, thus to make bold with his Superiours, when it appears by the Letters he has printed, that he has been very sharply reprov'd, rebuked, and confuted by some of our Prelates; and yet replied to them, as he owns himself, p. 26. in a Style too sharp, and unbecoming; which he saith he is sorry for; but yet adds, that because it was designed to recommend the sacred Truths of Christianity, he will however publish the Letter. A very bold Excuse indeed, that his Sharpness and unbecoming Behaviour to those he owes a Canonical Submission to, will propagate Christianity. Nor is he satisfied with this, but p. 49. irreverently begs the Bishop not to run himself, like his great Predecessor, aground in the Defence of modern Corruptions.

Gentilis.

P. 25. He returned into *Savoy*, believing the Churches there to be the most moderate.

Whiston.

Appen. P. 34. He thanks Divine Providence, that he lives in a Kingdom of Freedom and Liberty; where 'tis not very much

much, that by the Laws can be laid upon him for the sake of his Conscience; where with small legal Hazard he can greatly promote the true Religion of Christ Jesus: not in *Spain* or *Portugal*, subject to the Terror of a *Popish* Inquisition: where the speaking or writing a small Part of what he has spoken or written, would certainly have condemned him to a loathsome Dungeon or an ignominious Death.

How does this Man insult over the Government's *Moderation* and *Liberty of Conscience*? But does the Indulgence of our State to weak Consciences, give a sturdy Heretick a Licence to blaspheme? shall a Traitor, that Attempts the Life of a temporal Prince, be punished with Death? and shall he flatter himself, without so much as a censure, to *un-god* the eternal Son of God? Certainly tho' our Laws *de Heretico comburendo* are repealed, yet I hope, that tho' neither a *Popish* nor *Protestant* (for his elder Brother *Gentilis* was executed for his Treason in a *Protestant* Country) yet some *Inquisition* will be made into this Heresie; and this Heretick taught, that the Power of the Church in Controversies of Faith is not (as he calls it *Append. p. 30.*) pretended but real and lawful. The power of our Church indeed will seem but a *pretended one*, if this Heterodox *Pretender* shall be allowed to call for necessary Alterations in the Articles, Creeds, and

and Liturgy of our Church, *p.* 75. to frame new Creeds and Forms as he has done for Baptism, and make Use of the same, *p.* 89. to 98. in contempt of the Gown, which he wears to the great Disgrace of the Church he wears it in; if this same Man shall (as can be proved he has done in the Cathedral of our Metropolis) throw a publick Affront on our Doxology by his Behaviour: And all this he shall presume to do, as claiming the Benefit of a merciful and charitable *Moderation*.

Gentilis.

P. 27. He condemned the Protestants of *Bern*, as still subject to *Papal Slavery*; and he actually endeavoured to undermine the Doctrine of the Trinity; and *p.* 31, 32. in that Doctrine dissented from all the Orthodox; and used impious Blasphemies concerning that same sacred Subject; and *p.* 38. one of the prime Articles of our Faith, an Article so

Whiston.

P. 8. He calls our Faith about the Trinity, novel, antichristian, begun by old Hereticks, established by the Tyranny of the See of *Rome*, *p.* 75. He is ready to justify his Opinion and Practice in omitting the fourth Petition of our Litany, *p.* 64. the Moderns (saith he) talk mightily of these three Divine Persons being one in Substance and Divinity; so you carry that Notion

essential to the very Being of Christianity, that in the worst and darkest times of *Popery*, it still continued pure and uncorrupted. P. 40. he affirms that the Father alone is that *one only God* set forth to us in Holy Scripture. That the Son is subordinate to the Father, as to his Maker: P. 41. That the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost have three distinct Essences or Substances, and differ from each other in Order, Degree, and Propriety of Essence. P. 84. He upbraids *Athanasius* with corrupting the Nicene Creed, and calls his Creed mere impertinent Jargon.

tion in your Mind, and then the Expression looks that way to you, just as the 9th to the *Romans* looks plain for *Calvinism* to some modern Authors, &c. P. 65. The Duty of honest Men is to own what is so plain, that the one and only Supreme God is no other than God the Father; that the Son is subordinate to him; that the Holy Ghost is inferior and subordinate to both; that the Son was begotten or created by the Father only, before the World; that these Truths are plain in Scripture; tho' p. 1. contrary to the general Belief of Christians in these latter Ages. P. 27. Your Lordship (writing to the Bishop of *Worcester*) amazes me in intimating your own Satisfaction with the Creed of *Vigilius Thapsitanus*. One that knows the

M origi-

original State of Christianity so well as your Lordship might as well say the same of the Worship of Images, but that violent Prepossession for what is in the Church hinders the plainest Truths from being believed.

Gentilis.

P. 128, 229. He makes an open Challenge for a Dispute.

Whiston.

P. 70, 71, 72, 73, 74. He saith, that the fittest of those (to whose Perusal his Papers were referred, and in whose Perusal the Archbishop of *Canterbury* spent no small time) especially Mr. *Bennet* of *Colchester*, wholly denied to answer his Papers, tho' earnestly pressed to undertake it. He mentions a Challenge to Mr. *Bennet* and Dr. *Jenkins* never answer'd. He reckons up a dozen and a half of Clergymen of all Orders and Qualities who read his Papers; which he's fully satisfied are unanswerable; and that the learned, who are able to judge of them, can't but know, that they are not able to answer them. And *Append. p. 31.* his Words, in sense, are these: " I make
" an open and unanswerable Challenge to
" the whole Body of the Christian World;
" and venture, in the most solemn Manner,
" to appeal to the Consciences of all the
" truly learned, whether what I have affirmed
" be not undoubtedly and indisputably
" true;

“ true; and so whether I am not censur’d
 “ and expell’d [the University of Cambridge]
 “ for owning myself a Christian; nay, I
 “ may add, for asserting the first and most
 “ fundamental Doctrine of the whole Chri-
 “ stian Religion. This repeated Challenge
 “ may most easily be answered, as a former
 “ was, by a repeated Censure, for in any
 “ other way I am sure it cannot. And if
 “ that be again put in practice by any such
 “ like * Body of this Church; I shall only
 “ beg one Favour, that those who do it,
 “ will deal plainly, and declare that they
 “ are not, nor do pretend to be Christians,
 “ but † Members of the Church of *England*
 “ only: Or at least, that they are just so
 “ far Christians, as the original Doctrines
 “ and Duties of Christianity are agreeable
 “ to those contained in the XXXIX. Arti-
 “ cles, Book of Homilies, and Common
 “ Prayer, but no farther. And then it will
 “ be some small Satisfaction to have the
 “ World know, that in this Protestant Re-
 “ formed Country the Case is the very same
 “ as in *Popish* ones, where Christianity is no
 “ farther believed and obeyed, than as it
 “ agrees to the Decrees and Practices of the

* I would not mistake him, but this looks like a Defiance of our present Convocation.

† A scurrilous Reflection on the Church of *England*; but no Wonder if he reflects upon a particular Church, who by his Heretical new Creed has cut himself from the Communion of the Catholick and Apostolick one.

“ Church of *Rome*; with this difference,
 “ that since the Church of *Rome* pretends to
 “ Infallibility and Dominion over Consci-
 “ ence, which this disowns, this of the
 “ two is the most unjustifiable and inexcus-
 “ sable.

This Man's unparalleled Boldness, I re-
 commend to the Consideration of every pious
 Christian Reader. For my part, little and
 inconsiderable as I am; I could not in Con-
 science be silent in the Cause of our great
 Lord and Master, by whose infinite Merits;
 and of his Church, in whose Communion
 I hope to be saved; but have (to the best of
 my small Ability, in the Shortness of the
 time my Zeal has allowed me) set forth my
 Answer; hoping that God, through the
 means of our Church's Synod, now sitting,
 will hinder this Heretical Poison from spread-
 ing any farther.

But I must return to *Gentilis*, and give a
 short Account what Treatment he met with.

He p. 19, 36. at *Geneva* for those Errors
 was sentenced to undergo publick Penance,
 and abjure the same, and not to depart that
 City without leave; but he departed con-
 trary to the Oath he had taken, and p. 21.
 fled to *Fargia*, thence to *Lyons* and *Grenoble*,
 where, his Principles being discover'd, he craft-
 ily escaped by exhibiting a cunningly contri-
 ved Confession of Faith, levell'd particularly
 against *Calvin*. Then he went to *Chambray*,
 where

where p. 22. being disturb'd he returned to *Fargia*; which Town is in the Prefecture of *Gaium*; the Governour of *Gaium* apprehended and put him in Custody, but after some time released him, tho' still bound to his good behaviour; but yet he continued propagating his Errors, and sent a Confession to the Prefs, pretending the Governour's Command for so doing. Hence p. 23. he went back to *Lyons*, where having been imprisoned almost two Months he gain'd his Liberty by such another Trick as before. The next Summer he betook himself to *Poland*, and having for two Years disturbed the Peace of Church and State, he and his Crew were by the King's Proclamation against setters up of new Doctrines exell'd that Kingdom. Then p. 25. he joined himself with the Anabaptists in *Moravia*. Afterward he removed to *Vienna*, then to *Savoy*, and last (led by his own Folly) to *Gaium*, where the same Governour as before being continued clapp'd him in Prison, and p. 27. soon acquainted the Senate with his Confinement. The Senate sent for him, and p. 29. having continued him some time under Confinement, examined his Papers, and used all manner of means to no purpose, at last condemned him to die, p. 131. and p. 133. as the obstinate Wretch was led to Execution, he gloried that he died a Martyr for the Glory of the most high God.

Our

Our Heretick likewise in his Letters to the Bishop of *Ely*, and to Dr. *Roderick* the then Vice-chancellor of *Cambridge*, p. 77, 78, 86. assures them he is prepared for the worst, being fully resolved by God's Assistance to hazard his Life in this Cause; hoping God would afford him Grace and Courage to resist even unto Blood.

The brief Account of *Valentinus Gentilis*, out of which I have made the foregoing Extract, is very well worth the reading; not only for the Confutation of *Gentilis's* Opinions inserted in it, from partly some Texts of Scripture, partly the Judgment of *Justin*, *St. Ignatius*, *Tertullian*, &c. and for *Ben. Aretius's* learned Epistle to the Lords of *Bern*, on the Modesty, which ought to be used in Religious Matters: but also for the excellent Dedication of the Translation it self to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of *England*.

I have now gone through the Parallel of *Valentinus Gentilis* the *Campanian*, and this English Heretick; and protest from my heart, that I am far from wishing the Parallel to run through to the end: No; I do pray that this unhappy Man may repent, and save his Soul in the Day of the Lord, whose Divinity he hath so boldly affronted. What I have presented the Reader with in relation to *Gentilis*, is to inform him, how both Papists and Protestants equal-
ly

ly joined in their abhorrence of that Heresy, * and to exhort all to a *magnanimous Zeal and Courage in the Defence of the Faith*, tho' I confess I would not have it done the same way.

I can't conclude this Discourse better than with the excellent Collect of our Church on Trinity-Sunday.

Almighty and everlasting God, who hast given unto us thy Servants Grace by the Confession of a true Faith to acknowledge the Glory of the Eternal Trinity, and in the Power of the Divine Majesty to worship the Unity; we beseech thee, that thou wouldest keep us stedfast in this Faith, and ever more defend us from all Adversities, who livest and reignest One God World without end. Amen.

* Read the Advertisement concerning the Publication of *Valentinus Gentilis's History*.

FINIS.

Lately Published,

THE True Church-man and Loyal Subject.

The Principles of Deism truly represented, and set in a clear Light, in two Dialogues between a Sceptick, and a Deist; the first concerning the Christian Revelation, the second concerning Natural Religion.

Censura Temporum: The good or ill Tendencies of Books, Sermons, Pamphlets, &c. impartially consider'd, for the Years 1708 and 1709. in Two Volumes, 4^o.

An Answer to Mr. *de Fontenelle's* History of Oracles: In which Mr. *Vandale's* System concerning the Authors of the Heathen Oracles, and the Cause and Time of their Silence is confuted, and the Opinion of the Fathers upon that Subject vindicated. Written in *French* by the Archbishop of *Cambray*, and translated into English; (with some Reflections on the Remarks of Mr. *Le Clerc* in his *Bibliothèque Choisie* in a Preface) by the Author of a Vindication of the Church of *England*, in Answer to Priestcraft in Perfection.

Considerations upon refin'd Politicks, and the Master-strokes of State, as practis'd by the Ancients and Moderns. Written in *French* by *Gabriel Naude*, and inscrib'd to the Cardinal *Bagni*. Translated into English by Dr. *King*.

Providence vindicated, as permitting Wickedness and Mischief, In a Sermon preach'd at *Bath*, on *September* the 17th 1710. Published for the Satisfaction of some who were displeased at certain Passages in it.